

The University of Chicago

STUDIES IN DRAMATIC "PREPARA-
TION" IN ROMAN COMEDY

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE
HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF LATIN LANGUAGE
AND LITERATURE

1933

By

PHILIP WHALEY HARSH

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1935

The University of Chicago

STUDIES IN DRAMATIC "PREPARA-
TION" IN ROMAN COMEDY

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE
HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF LATIN LANGUAGE
AND LITERATURE

1933

By

PHILIP WHALEY HARSH

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1935

COPYRIGHT 1935 BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. PUBLISHED JUNE 1935

Composed and Printed by the University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
 Chapter	
I. PREPARATION FOR CERTAIN TYPES OF IMPORTANT CHARACTERS	
1. Certain Types of Complicating Characters	13
a. False Preparation or Notable Lack of Preparation for Certain Types of Complicating Characters. . .	16
2. The Resolving Character	17
a. False Preparation or Notable Lack of Preparation for the Resolving Character	23
II. PREPARATION FOR IMPORTANT PHASES OF ACTION	
1. Complication	25
a. False Preparation or Notable Lack of Prepara- tion for Complication	32
2. Recognition (Resolution - Preparation for other phases of resolution is found under sections I.2; II.3-4; III.2-3.)	34
a. False Preparation or Notable Lack of Prepara- tion for Recognition	51
3. Intrigue (Complication and Resolution).	56
a. False Preparation or Notable Lack of Prepara- tion for Intrigue	73
4. General Future Action (Complication and Resolution)	76
III. PREPARATION FOR INCIDENTAL PHASES OF ACTION	
1. Complication	80
a. False Preparation for Complication	82
2. Events Incident to the Happy Ending	83
a. False Preparation or Notable Lack of Prepara- tion for Events Incident to the Happy Ending . .	86
3. General Future Action	91
a. False Preparation for General Future Action . .	92
1. Excursus on Quasi-Preparation	93
CONCLUSION	97



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41548814_0015

INTRODUCTION

In Greek Rhetoric, the words *παρασκευή* and *προπαρασκευή* are used to denote those artifices by which the audience is put into a sympathetic disposition towards the speaker or is prejudiced in behalf of his cause.¹ In Latin, these terms are translated *praeparatio* or *praestructio*, words which have the same technical connotation as their Greek equivalents.²

¹Cf. *Prolegomenon Sylloge, Excerpta Corporis P.*, II 2-4 (ed. Rabe, Leipzig, 1931, p. 62, l. 2 ff.): *τί ἐστι προοίμιον; λόγος παρασκευάζων τὸν ἀκροατὴν καὶ οἰκείως διατιθεῖς πρὸς τὸ παραδέξασθαι ἢ ἀποθέσθαι τὸδε τι πάθος τῆς ψυχῆς*. Cf. Apsines, *Ars Rhetorica* (Spengel-Hammer, Leipzig, 1894, p. 306, l. 20 ff.): *Ἐπειδὴν δὲ μέλλωμεν ἔλεον κινεῖν προπαρασκευάζομεν τὸν δικάστην πρὸς τοῦτο ἡμῖν ἐπιτηδεύως ἔχειν* ... Cf. Aristotle, *Ar. Rhet.*, B 9.16: ... *ἐάν τοὺς τε κριτὰς τοιοῦτους παρασκευάσῃ ὁ λόγος*

... The words *κατασκευή* and *προκατασκευή* are used in much the same way. Cf. Aristotle *Ar. Rhet.* B 1.2: ... *ἀνάγκη μὴ μόνον πρὸς τὸν λόγον ὁρᾶν, ὅπως ἀποδεικτικὸς ἐστὶ καὶ πιστός, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸν ποιῶν τινα καὶ τὸν κριτὴν κατασκευάζειν* ... (Cf. schol. ad Eur. *Hec.* 234-7; 824; *And.* 147 (Dindorf); and ad *Soph. O.C.* 1257. These words, especially *παρασκευή*, are used frequently by the Attic orators themselves with somewhat different connotations, usually referring to the artifices of all sorts which the opponent has used in his effort to obtain a favorable verdict. It is a standard word in the prooemium: *Andoc.* I 1 (cf. note in Blass-Fuhr⁴, Leipzig, 1913); *Lysias* XIX 2; *Demos.* xxvii, 2; xxx, 3. Frequently, of course, the words are used both by the orators and the rhetoricians with a variety of other meanings. So in the Commentary of Donatus, *praeparare* is used with no technical significance, apparently, ad *Ph.* 319.1.

²Cf. Quint. *Inst. Or.*, IV 2, 54-57: *Ne illud quidem fuerit inutile, semina quaedam probationum spargere, verum sic ut narrationem esse meminerimus non probationem. Nonnunquam tamen etiam argumento aliquo confirmabimus quod proposuerimus, sed simplici et brevi, ut in beneficiis: Sanus bibit, statim concidit, livor ac tumor confestim est insecutus. Hoc faciunt et illae praeparationes, cum reus dicitur robustus, armatus, (paratus) contra infirmos, inermes, securos. ... Optimae vero praeparationes erunt, quae latuerint. ... Cf. Cic. *Or.* 99: Qui enim nihil potest tranquille, nihil leniter, nihil partite definite distincte facere dicere, praesertim cum causae partim totae sint eo modo partim aliqua ex parte tractandae si is non praeparatis auribus inflammare rem coepit, furere apud sanos et quasi inter sobrios bacchari vinu-*

Oeconomia is likewise found in the Rhetoricians, denoting the artful arrangement of material.³ But the word is equally at home in the field of literary criticism, being found in Aristotle's *Poetics*⁴ and frequently elsewhere.⁵ It denotes "composition" in all its phases except the actual writing of the words.⁶

lentus videtur. Cf. Fortunatianus, *Ars Rhetorica* II 15 (ed. Halm, *Rhetores Latini Minores*, Leipzig, 1853, p. 110, l. 22 ff.): Quid est proparasceue, sive praeparatio sive praestructio? Procatasceua est, qua iudicem nobis praeparamus, cum aut quaedam nobis obsunt et illis prius occurrendum est, ut fecit Cicero pro Oppio contra M. Cottae auctoritatem: aut cum quaedam prosunt et ea debemus utiliter spargere, quae nobis per totam actionem prodesse possint, ut pro rege Deiotaro, ubi ostendit qua fiducia adversarii et quid opinantes Deiotarum reum ad Caesarem devocarint. Cf. Corp. Glos. II 396.19. Cf. [Julius Rufinianus] *De Schematis Dianoemas* 3 (ed. Halm, p. 60, l. 22 ff.): Προκατάσκευή est procatalepsi proxima, cum rei, de qua acturi sumus, colorem praeparamus atque praetendimus, ut in illo:

Anna soror, quae me suspensam insomnia terrent;
usque: quae bella exhausta canebat: Nam primo de insomnia quaestata est, dein admirari se virtutem hospitis dixit et veram fidem esse, a diis illum genus ducere: misereri etiam casus et errores, ut verecundius postea de amore fateretur, quasi in affectum hospititis vel insomnia vel admiratione virtutis vel miseratione calamitatis inducta sit. Haec figura dicitur Latine praeparatio.
³Cf. Sulpitius Victor, *Inst. Oratoriae* 14 (ed. Halm, p. 320, l. 11 ff.): In dispositione haec sunt: ordo cum ea, quae Graece appellatur οἰκονομία, dehinc elocutio, tum pronuntiatio. Ordo est, ut secundum textum naturalem singula persequamur, primum in partibus elocutionis, ut sit scilicet primus exordium <tum> narratio, tum partes argumentationis, peroratio demum extrema. Sed bene huic ordini οἰκονομία proxima adiuncta est, quae hoc distat a superiore, quod ille quidem ordo naturalis, hic ordo artificiosus est. Cf. Corp. Gloss. V 35.5 (Placidius): oeconomia est ipsa dispositio rei alicuius prius sicut ordinatur et disponitur domus et sic fabricatur sic et a poetis et ab actoribus oeconomia prius ordinatur et sic describitur utputa ne lederetur iuno per didonem troianorum regem haec dispositio oeconomia dicitur.

⁴ 1453 a (Here, the verb is used.)

⁵Schol. ad *Odyss.* I 328; Aesch. *Eu.* 47; Soph. *El.* 448, 1384; Eur. *Hip.* 713 (Schwartz), etc.

⁶Cf. the words of Menander apud Plutarch, *Glor. Athen.* 347 F, on which Wilamowitz remarks (*Die Kunst des Menander, Das Schiedsgericht* (Epitrepontes), Berlin, 1925, p. 118, note 1): "Das οἰκονομείν umfasst alles bis auf die Niederschrift der Verse." Cf. Servius ad Aen. I 226: proeconomia id est dispositio carminis. Paul G. Moorhead (*The Comments on the Content and Form of the Comic Plot in the Commentum Terenti Ascribed to Donatus*, University of Chicago dissertation, 1923 (unpublished), p. 110) defines the term as follows: "οἰκονομία is the larger division of dramatic technique under which fall all devices, dispositions and arrangements of the dramatic action by which plausi-

In the commentary of Donatus on Terence, these words occur frequently. Oeconomia⁷ naturally has the wider meaning and includes praeparatio and praestructio as well as other categories. Sometimes the terms oeconomia and praeparatio or praestructio are both used to refer to the same phenomenon.⁸ In somewhat similar cases, the word verisimile or τὸ πιθανόν or an equivalent also occurs.⁹ This, "the plausible," I take to be one type of praepa-

bility and realistic acting are secured: by which events follow each other in a natural order of cause and effect and characters act realistically of their own accord without the apparent intrusion of the poet's design, -- it is dramatic motivation in a wide sense." (numerous footnotes omitted) Cf. Quint. Inst. Or. I 8, 8-9: Multum autem veteres etiam Latini conferunt, (quamquam plerique plus ingenio quam arte valuerunt) in primis copiam verborum, quorum in tragoediis gravitas, in comoediis elegantia et quidam velut αἰνισμὸς inveniri potest. Oeconomia quoque in iis (his AP) diligentior quam in plerisque novorum erit, qui omnium operum solam virtutem sententias putaverunt. Cf. Servius ad Aen. XII 266: hoc loco ab Homeri oeconomia recessit: ille enim inducit Minervam persuadentem Pandaro, ut iacto in Menelaum telo dissipet foedera; hic vero dicit ipsum augurem telum sponte torsisse et occidisse unum de novem fratribus. Quod pertinet ad oeconomiam; necesse enim erat ut fratres dolore ex unius morte commoti bellum moverent. si enim velis aliquid interiret, poterat eius mors ob foederis religionem forte contemni.

⁷This word occurs in nineteen scholia in the commentary on Terence. The word προοικονομία occurs once. All these cases are listed below. In the references below, all citations of the plays of Terence refer to the commentary on the lines cited unless otherwise specified.

⁸E.g., Eun. 440.2: hic magna οἰκονομία est, qua Terentius praeparat, quemadmodum iurgium inter Thaidem militemque et Gnathonem per duas partes serpat fabulae. Referring to this same quarrel, the commentator uses οἰκονομία, Eun. 434 and 501; προπαρασκευή Eun. 495.1; and apparatus Eun. 624.2 (where Eun. 440 ff. is referred to). No such term is used Eun. 436 (causa). Doubtless some of this variation is due to different authorship of the scholia. On this point, cf. the following note. In the comment on An. 399.3, οἰκονομία is used, but in referring to this later, the commentator used praestruere (An. 607.1; for the MSS. variation which usually accompanies this word, as it does here, cf. below, note 18). Cf. Corp. Glos. V 36.12 (Placidius: repeated elsewhere in the Corpus): Oeconomia est dispositio vel praemeditatio vel praeparatio.

⁹When the artifices are under consideration by which Chaerea's not knowing the next door neighbor is made plausible, the commentator uses οἰκονομία, Eun. 359.2; verisimile, Eun. 359.3 (causa); and 360.2; τὸ πιθανόν, Eun. 360.1; and praestruere, Eun. 374.4. Cf. Eun. 290.1 and 359.1. With regard to the comments on Eun. 359, 360, we very evidently have scholia from various hands.

ratio or praestructio. Other cases of oeconomia occur wherein the terms seem to be used with the same connotation as is attached to praeparatio and praestructio, although neither of the latter terms is actually used to refer to the same instance.¹⁰ More frequently, oeconomia seems to be used in a wider sense, which can sometimes be defined as "plot necessity."¹¹ Once the term occurs where we might fairly expect praeparatio or praestructio in the strictly rhetorical sense.¹²

Praeparatio is frequently found in Donatus¹³ with the technical rhetorical meaning cited above.¹⁴ In this sense, oeconomia seems to occur once,¹² and praestruere perhaps once,¹⁵ as apparently procuratio also once.¹⁶ These comments are upon rhetorical, not dramatic, phenomena, and the present study does not attempt to deal with these rhetorical matters.

But praeparatio (praeparare)¹⁷ and praestructio (praestruc-

¹⁰E.g., Eu. 230.1; 446.1# (cf. Hec. 789.2 and Ph.238). Perhaps Ad. 356.

¹¹Eu. 609.2 (cf. 840.1), An. 228.1; 459.1; 481.1; 623; Ph. 534; 750.2; Hec. 175.3; ?? Ad. 78.1#; 441.2.

¹²Ad. 211.2. Cf. Ph. 623.2 (praeparare).

¹³An. 285.3; 352.3; Ph. 623.2; ?Hec. 174.2; ?Ad. 290.1. παρασκευή: perhaps Eu. 103. This word is used with reference to the name of a character mentioned before that character's entrance: An. 226.1; Ph. 101.3 (?). Cf. προθέρενευσις (Steph., ##### codd.) Ad. 481.4 (cf. Ad. 500). Cf. schol. ad Soph. Aj. 762; ad Eur. Hec. 824 (Dindorf). The rhetorical use of παρασκευή or προπαρασκευή is common in Greek scholia. Cf. ad Eur. Hec. 234-7 (Dindorf); Soph. Aj. 1043. Cf. above, note 1.

¹⁴Cf. above notes 1 and 2.

¹⁵Ph. 98.3#

¹⁶Ad. 487.1

¹⁷Here begin the classifications with which this study is concerned. In the following notes, the occurrences of the words under consideration will be listed under two heads. Those under the first (1) are included in this study; those under the second (2) are not included for reasons explained in the discussion which follows.

(1) Eu. 231.2; 440.2; 611; Ph. 83.2; 169.2; 295.1; 312; 679; Ad 208.

(2) Ph. 70.1 (cf. insinuandum, Ph. 120.1 with reference to 69); 238.2; Hec. 261.

re)¹⁸ and their Greek equivalents *παρὰσκευή*¹⁹ and *προπαρὰσκευή*²⁰ are also used to refer to certain features of dramatic technique. These usages may be classified in two large groups with reference to their effects upon the audience. The first group may roughly be defined as suggestions or hints of future action, the significance of which the habitual playgoer may fairly be expected to grasp (foreshadowing); the second group, as precautions or prearrangements of circumstance the significance of which the habitual playgoer probably does not grasp at the time but may consciously recall later, or by which he may unconsciously be put into a more receptive mood for the action which is to come. Still, it must be admitted that while an occasional case can be cited that is definitely in one category rather than the other,²¹ such classifications are of an arbitrary nature and based upon subjective opinion. Considering the commentary as a whole, I can find no such distinction in the use of terms.²² In fact, here, as in the case of *oeconomia*, the commentary is very loose in its use of terms. Not only do apparently different commentators use differ-

¹⁸(1) An. 119.3#; 274.1; 607.1#; Eu. 298.2; Ph. 269.1#

(2) Eu. 374.4#; Ph. 153.3#; 304.2#; Hec. 789.2

Repeated MSS. variation with regard to this word is to be noted: An. 119.3 (*prostruxisse* V *praestrixisse* A *praescripsisse* C) An. 607.1 (*praestrinxit* V *corr.* in *praestruxit* *praescripsit* (in *mg.* *praestruit*) C (*praestupsit*) T). Eu. 298.2 (C) Eu. 374.4 (*prescripsit* TC *praestrinxit* V *corr.* in *praestruxit*) Ph. 98.3 (*astruuntur* V); 153.3 (*praestructio* (in *mg.* *aliter perscriptio*) C); 269.1 (*restituat* RCO); 304.2 (*praestituitur* RCO). *Praescriptio* is a legal-rhetorical term and is used in its technical sense Ph. 411 (*perscriptio* C). In the present study, this MSS. variation is of no great importance. It is the phenomenon, not the terminology, which is primarily under consideration.

¹⁹(1) Hec. 574.1; Ad. 263.4#

²⁰(1) Eu. 495.1; 620#

²¹Foreshadowing: An. 119.3-4

Precaution for plausibility: Eu. 290.1

²²Cf. notes and discussion above. Verisimile and τὸ πιθανόν are not apparently used for first category above (foreshadowing); so perhaps a real distinction is made here in the commentary. The Greek words, *παρὰσκευή* and *προπαρὰσκευή*, do not seem to be used for the second category.

ent terms to refer to the same phenomenon,²³ but the same commentator as well evidently does so.²⁴ Besides the terms already cited in this paragraph, the following are used to refer to the same or to similar phenomena; adiuvare;²⁵ apparatum;²⁶ incredibile;²⁷ oeconomia;²⁸ parare;²⁹ promittere;³⁰ respicere;³¹ spectare;³² verisimile;³³ τὸ πιθανόν ;³⁴ προοικονομία ;³⁵ χαρακτηρισμός .³⁶

²³E.g., Eu. 359.1-3

²⁴E.g., Eu. 440.2

²⁵(1) An. 119.4

(2) An. 64.2 and (rhetorical?) Ph. 98.4

This term is also used in Rhetoric, but there seems to be no very close connection between its use there and its use here. Cf. Quint. In. Or., V 12,6; Fortunatianus, Ar. Rhet., II 2 (ed. Halm, p. 103, l. 25).

²⁶(1) Eu. 624.2

(2) Rhetorical: Eu. 553

²⁷(2) Ph. 238.2

²⁸(1) An. 399.3; Eu. 230.1; 434; 440.2; 501# (The last three Eu. passages refer to the same phenomenon -- the quarrel between Thraso and Thais.)

(2) Eu. 359.2; 446.1#; Ad. 78.1; 356; 441.2

²⁹(1) An. 71.2; Ph. 149

Cf. Cicero Or. 122: Quid enim iam sequitur, quod quidem artis sit, nisi ordiri orationem, in quo aut concilietur auditor aut erigatur aut paret se ad discendum ... Cf. Ter. Eu. 240:

itan parasti te ut spes nulla relicua in te siet tibi?
(praepr. G. tibi exp. G)

Cf. Ter. Hec. 68

³⁰(1) Eu. 206; 224.4

Cf. Isidor, de Rhet. XXI 44 (ed. Halm, p. 521, l. 33 ff.): Epangelia est promissio qua iudicem adtentum facimus pollicentes nos aliqua magna aut minima dicturus. Cf. Cicero de Or. II 339: His quattuor causis totidem medicinae opponuntur: tum obiurgatio, si est auctoritas; tum admonitio quasi lenior obiurgatio; tum promissio, si audierint, probaturus; tum deprecatio, quod est infirmum sed non nunquam utile.

³¹(1) Ph. 319.2

(2) Hec. 489.1

Cf. Quint. In Or. IX 2, 28: Nam Cicero cum dicit pro Ligario ... non solum ad utilitatem Ligarii respicit sed magis laudare victoris clementiam non potest.

³²(2) Hec. 361.1

³³(2) Eu. 359.3; 360.2; 446.1; Hec. 58.3; 789.2

Cf. verisimilis defensio (e.g., C. Iulius Victor IV 2 (Halm, p. 387, l. 12, 20, and 28), verisimilis probatio (e.g., Sulpitius Victor, Inst. Or. 26 (ed. Halm, p. 327, l. 3 ff.)).

³⁴(2) An. 447.2; Eu. 296.2; 360.1; Ad. 511.2#, cf. Hec. 138.3#. Rhetorical: Ad. 654.1#

³⁵(1) Eu. 719 (cf. Eu. 446.1# with Karsten's critical note.) Cf. schol. ad. Odys. VIII 215 and I 262 (below note 38).

There are also more general notices where no word appears to be used with a technical meaning.³⁷

Praeparatio or preparation, as it will hereafter be called, is an important consideration, then, in the commentary on Terence. It is recognized by other scholia in both Greek and Latin.³⁸ Indeed, the phenomenon is referred to several times in the plays of Plautus in violation of the dramatic illusion. In the *Cistellaria*, the procuress at the end of her expository monologue says:

147 haec sic res gesta est. si quid usus uenerit,
meminisse ego hanc rem uos uolo. ...

Again, Mnesilochus in the *Bacchides* after delivering a monologue containing various threats and predictions, remarks:

sed satine ego animum mente sincera gero,
510 qui ad hunc modum haec hic quae futura fabulor?

These are monologues, but an even bolder statement comes in the midst of a dialogue in the *Poenulus*:

550 omnia istaec scimus iam nos, si hi spectatores sciant;
horunc hic nunc caussa haec agitur spectatorum fabula:
hos te satius est docere, ut, quando agas, quid agas sciant.

The present study is based upon the comments found in the commentary of Donatus which refer to preparation, excluding, however, the purely rhetorical phenomena and also all cases which are termed "the plausible." The rhetorical phenomena are clearly not concerned with dramatic technique. "The plausible" is concerned with dramatic technique, but mainly in regard to character

36 (2) Eu. 301.4# (cf. Hec. 352)

37 Cf. Ph. 94; etc.

38 Cf. schol. ad Odyss. I 262 (with reference also to VIII 215 and IX 156) with regard to the mention of arrows: ὁ ἅλιν οὖν ὅτι προκατασκευάσμετα τῆς μνηστῆροκτονίας ... Schol. ad Ar. Aves 654 (προκατασκευάζειν); schol. ad Eurip. Med. 40: ὁ δὲ Εὐριπίδης τὰ μέλλοντα ἀναφώνεῖ ... ἔθος ... προλέγειν τὰ μέλλοντα. There is a difference, of course, between foreshadowing and foretelling. Med. 40 is properly the former, but the commentator's terminology is loose, just as the terminology in the commentary of Donatus. Cf. also Servius ad Verg. Aen. I 226; III 491; IV 555; V 27, etc.

portrayal. For instance, the portrayal of Chaerea in the *Eunuchus* as ante annos amator is a characterization which makes plausible his swift violation of Pamphila. This characterization is noticed some four or five times in Donatus,³⁹ but it is clearly a matter that must be studied in connection with character treatment in general. Other cases noticed under "the plausible" in Donatus hardly come under the head of characterization, but are still foreign to the type of preparation with which the present study is concerned. For instance, Chaerea in the *Eunuchus* does not know Thais, who lives next door. It is essential to the plot that he should not know her, as it is essential also that both the house of Thais and the house of Chaerea's family should be represented on stage. To make the action plausible, then, the poet has presented Chaerea as away on guard duty living at the Piraeus. This fact is noticed no less than seven times in the commentary.⁴⁰ The deftness which the poets of New Comedy attained in such invention might make an interesting study, but it is not germane to the present consideration, the great part of which may properly be termed foreshadowing within the body of the play. Such foreshadowing would probably not be intelligible to a person visiting the theatre for the first time, but it would not be entirely lost on such a one. For instance, when Selenium in the *Cistellaria* is presented as a modest and virtuous girl, a person unacquainted with New Comedy might foresee nothing, but when the recognition is accomplished and Selenium takes her place in respectable society, such a person is not offended for morality has been upheld and virtue rewarded. The prologues spoken from the omniscient point of view in Plautus are properly foretelling and are entirely omit-

³⁹*Eu.* 292.1; 296.2; 301.4-5; 320

⁴⁰*Eu.* 290.1; 359.1-3; 360.1-2; 374.4.

ted in the present study.⁴¹ But not quite all the material herein considered can be called foreshadowing, for the term preparation does not necessarily carry such a connotation. When Simo in the *Andria* mentions the kinsmen of Chrysis, probably few if any of the spectators would consider this foreshadowing for the entrance of one of these kinsmen (Crito), but the poet almost unquestionably had Crito in mind when he wrote the line, and perhaps some of the audience would recall the line when Crito actually appeared. When Callidamates in the *Mostellaria* instructs his slave to come for him in good time, we catch no hint of the part which the adversitores will play in the latter part of the play, but when they appear on stage, we immediately recall the preceding action and admire the poet's nice prearrangement of circumstance. It is not necessary to attempt a more precise definition since the material in Donatus after the above exceptions are made naturally falls into a few well defined categories when viewed from the standpoint of dramatic function: preparation for recognition, for the entrance of the resolving character, for certain events incident to the happy ending (such as the freeing of slaves, incidental marriages, etc.); preparation for intrigues and deceptions, for the arrival of the long absent father, for other complicating action such as quarrels, exposures, etc. The present study undertakes to collect the material in Donatus, and using this material as a basis, to study the cases in Terence which go unnoticed in the commentary but which seem to be parallel to the cases noticed, and to study all the cases that appear to be parallel in Plautus and in Menander. Owing to the extremely fragmentary condition of the

⁴¹Am. 463-98 is not considered since it is merely a continuation of the prologue from the omniscient point of view, as is 961-81, also not considered. Cf. Flickinger, The Greek Theater and Its Drama,³ p. 304.

extant plays of Menander, few examples can be cited from him with any assurance, but these few, of course, are very important.

The material has been arranged from the standpoint of dramatic function. For purposes of study, it is often convenient to divide the play into exposition, complication, and resolution. This is a mechanical division, however, and we must not overlook the fact that although these three divisions follow one another in consecutive order as a rule, bits of exposition may be found throughout the play, minor solutions may occur before the main complication, and minor complications after the main solution. Furthermore, not infrequently action occurs which can scarcely be included under any of these headings.

In the various sections of this study, the plays of known Greek authorship are usually treated first, beginning with the plays of Menander, except that this order has sometimes been broken to group similar phenomena together.

An attempt has been made to take some notice of the most widely accepted theories of contamination and Roman originality. Such notice is confined to the footnotes and necessarily does not take into consideration all that has been said on any given point. The present study approaches these very difficult problems from an angle that, to be sure, has not been overlooked by the more careful students of contamination, but has never been thoroughly studied especially in plays not suspected of contamination. At first glance, the points noticed herein may seem very small ones, but the a priore assumption is that such subtleties are the very details which an inferior author is least likely to imitate or a contaminator deliberately to insert or to exclude. The study was undertaken primarily as a study of dramatic method and with little thought of its bearing on contamination. Unfortunately, however,

almost all the evidence on contamination that has been unearthed during the study is of a negative sort, and so consistently has evidence been presented against theories of contamination or originality that I should like here to state my position on the subject apart from the results of the present study. In view of the statement of Terence (An. 18 ff.), I think that it is extremely likely that one or more of the extant plays of Plautus may be contaminated. But I have been unable to discover convincing evidence of contamination in any play. So frequently have arguments patently untenable been advanced, and so widely do the various advocates of contamination and Roman originality differ, that one cannot avoid becoming skeptical of all such arguments. The negative evidence here presented is interpreted not as disproving contamination in the plays, but merely as invalidating certain theories as to the nature and extent of contamination, and as suggesting that our present knowledge of some of the points of dramatic technique used as arguments is slight and faulty. With regard to Plautus, cognizance has been taken especially of the works of Leo,⁴² Fraenkel,⁴³ and Jachmann.⁴⁴ Frequently a mere reference to a discussion by one of these scholars is given, which, of course, implies nothing with regard to agreement or disagreement, but is simply intended to indicate that the discussion cited must be reckoned with. Discussions by Legrand⁴⁵ are sometimes cited.

⁴²Leo, Plautinische Forschungen², Berlin: Weidmann, 1912 (cited as Leo, P.F.)

Leo, Geschichte der Roemischen Literatur, Berlin: Weidmann 1913 (cited as Leo, Gesch.)

⁴³Fraenkel, Plautinisches im Plautus, Philologische Untersuchungen, vol. xxviii, Berlin: Weidmann, 1922 (cited as Fraenkel)

⁴⁴Jachmann, Plautinisches und Attisches, Problemata, vol. v, Berlin: Weidmann, 1931 (cited as Jachmann).

⁴⁵Legrand, Daos, Lyon: A. Rey, Paris: A. Fontemoing, 1910 (cited as Legrand).

The texts used for this study are as follows:⁴⁶

Aeli Donati Quod Fertur Commentum Terenti, Wessner, Leipzig:

B. G. Teubner, 1902, 1905

Menandri Reliquiae, Jensen, Berlin: Weidmann, 1929.⁴⁷

T. Macci Plauti Comoediae, Lindsay, Oxford, 1903 (1910)

P. Terenti Afri Comoediae, Kauer-Lindsay, Oxford, 1926.

I wish to express my sincere thanks to Professor Prescott
for his many suggestions and criticisms.

Chicago, Illinois

June, 1933

⁴⁶The plays of Plautus, Terence, and Menander are referred to by abbreviations of the name of the plays, consisting of as many letters as are necessary to preclude confusion, but never less than two letters. Thus Epid.: Epidicus, Epit.: Epitrepontes, etc.

⁴⁷Only fragments of Menander contained in this volume are considered in the present study.

I. PREPARATION FOR CERTAIN TYPES OF IMPORTANT CHARACTERS

1. Certain Types of Complicating Characters¹

The first intervention of Philoxenus in the *Bacchides* is foreshadowed by Lydus' intimation that he will report the young man's scandalous conduct to his father (375 ff.). The second intervention (1076) receives no preparation. These interventions are hardly more than potential complications.

Certain lines of the *Colax* probably foreshadow the appearance of the soldier, Bias with "as many followers as Odysseus brought to Troy" and the usual siege scene (99 ff.).

Likewise, the words of Thais in the *Eunuchus* (739 ff.) foretell the appearance of Thraso and his army.

In the *Periciromene*, vss. 174 f. and the numerous threats of Sosia in the following scene (189 ff.) forewhadow the appearance of Polemo and his army with their threat to carry off Glycera by force.

The return of Pamphilus in the *Hecyra* is incidentally referred to by Parmeno (76 f.), who upon leaving the house gives as a possible excuse for his absence the information that he is going

¹The main type here considered is that of the returning father (in the *Hecyra*, the son), who becomes one of the main characters of the play. The summoning of a character is not considered. For instance, Geta in the *Phormio* promises to bring Phormio to Demipho (308). The two appear, vs. 315. In the *Periciromene*, Davus reveals his intention of fetching his young master (74). The two appear after the chorus that immediately follows the exit of Davus. Occasionally a character will himself announce his intended return. So Chremes An. 594. He returns at vs. 740. (On this type, cf. Conrad, *The Technique of Continuous Action in Roman Comedy*, University of Chicago dissertation, 1914, p. 22.)

to the harbor to enquire about the return of Pamphilus, and he actually does go (cf. 194, 281 ff.). Just before the entrance of Pamphilus (281), Sostrata says as she leaves the stage (she had not seen her son coming):²

280 ... nisi pol filium multimodis iam exspecto ut redeat domum.

In the Phormio, the return of the two fathers is discussed somewhat indefinitely in the exposition scene (147 ff.). Geta informs his friend that he has just heard of the arrival of the letter and that he is now going to the harbor after it. On this the commentator remarks:

149 SED EPISTOLAM AB EO ALLATAM ESSE AVDIVI mire paratur inopinatus subito aduentus senis; nam ipse ueniet, cuius epistolam sperat.

In the entrance speech of Antipho, the return of his father receives a much more important place (153 ff.) than it has in the exposition, as Antipho is terrified at the very thought of his return:

160 ... at non cotidiana cura haec angeret animum, ...
dum exspecto quam mox veniat qui adimat hanc mi consuetudinem.

The return is actually announced, vs. 184, and Demipho appears vs. 231. The ridiculous advocati in the Phormio appear with Demipho after he has said that he would go and summon them in order that he might be fully prepared to deal with Phormio (312 ff.). Donatus notes the preparation:

312.2 ATQVE ALIQVOT MIHI AMICOS ADVOCABO iam praeparat ridiculam aduocationem, qua plures adhibendo iuris consultos incertior reddetur.

In the Mercator, Lysimachus is afraid that his wife will come home "tomorrow" and find the girl in his house (584 ff.; cf.

²Cf. Au. 697. Cf. Key, Introduction of Characters by Personal Names in Greek and Roman Comedy, University of Chicago dissertation, 1916, p. 93. (Only passages where the name is used are here considered.)

279 ff.). She does come home -- a day earlier than he expected. The appearance of the cook, who causes so much confusion is foreshadowed by Demipho's suggestion of hiring a cook and having a luncheon (578 ff.), and later, by Lysidamus, who reports that he has hired a cook and is awaiting his arrival (697 f.).

The arrival of Theopropides in the *Mostellaria* is foreshadowed from the very beginning of the play. Grumio fervently hopes that his master will return before house and home are thoroughly destroyed (11 f.; 78 ff., cf. Leo, P.F. 136 f.; cf. 57). When Philolaches expresses the wish that he might receive news of his father's death in order to renounce his patrimony in favor of Philematium (233 f.; cf. 229), we are tempted to paraphrase the commentator and say:³

mire paratur inopinatus subito aduentus senis; nam ipse ueniet,
culus mortem sperat.

After this preparation, we immediately recognize the cause of Tranio's perturbation when he arrives from the harbor (348 ff., cf. Fraenkel, 185 f.). The very fact that Tranio sets off at the beginning of the play for Piraeus (66) may have been recognized as significant.⁴

In the *Truculentus*, the arrival of the soldier, Stratophanes, is foreshadowed, first by the words of Diniarchus, who also foresees the intrigue that Phronesium intends to play upon him (84 ff.; cf. 194 ff., 336 ff.). Later Phronesium confesses her plan to Diniarchus (389 ff.; cf. 464 ff.), and says that the soldier will arrive presently (412 f.; cf. 474, 481). The soldier

³Cf. Donatus ad Ph. 149, quoted above.

⁴Cf. Ph. 198:

... AN. eloquere. GE. modo apud portum .. AN. meumne?
GE. intellexti. AN. occidi. ...

Antipho knows, upon the mere mention of the "port", that his father (or Phaedria's) has returned.

appears at vs. 482. When Phronesium is explaining how she procured the child, she mentions "our slave, the barber Sura" with something more than casual reference (405 ff.). When Callicles appears with two servant girls bound, one of whom is identified as "these people's barber", we immediately suspect some complication concerning the child, and Diniarchus' fears reveal his implication in the affair (770 ff., cf. 785 f., 794 f.). Incidentally, the earlier reference makes plausible Diniarchus' readily recognizing the girl, for he there admitted that he knew her.⁵

In the *Curculio*, the arrival of the parasite, *Curculio*, and the money for the purchase of *Planesium* are the subject of anxious anticipation from the beginning of the play.⁶ Since he brings no money but only a plan of intrigue, perhaps he may be considered a complicating character.

In the *Poenulus* *Agorastocles* reveals his intention of summoning advocati (447; cf. 424). He appears with them soon afterwards (504).

When *Callicles* in the *Trinummus* hears of the marriage proposal from *Stasimus*, he informs the audience that he intends to go and seek advice from his corrector, *Megaronides* (614). Later the two appear together and plan their deception (729 ff.).

In the *Vidularia*, *Cacistus* expresses his intention of finding an advocatus (56 f.; 68).

a. False Preparation or Notable Lack of Preparation for Certain Types of Complicating Characters

In the *Amphitruo* after the scene of misunderstanding be-

⁵But Leo (P.F. 206) says:

Aber die Entwicklung, die gegen Ende des Stuecks (770 sq.) die Geschichte des Diniarchus nimmt, ist gar nicht vorbereitet; ... es ist ganz klar, dass das Original eine Vorrede gehabt hat.

⁶Cf. 67 ff.; 143 f.; 206 f.; 225 ff.; 251 ff.

tween Alcumena and Amphitruo, the latter says that he will fetch Naucrates as arbiter of the quarrel (854), but he does not find Naucrates (1009 ff.).

Although Mnesilochus in the Bacchides is referred to or mentioned several times before his appearance (26; 60; 103), his arrival home from abroad receives practically no preparation.

The arrival of Clinia in the Heauton hardly takes place within the play (cf. 181 ff.), and there is little opportunity to foreshadow his appearance. Menedemus very naturally mentions his name in the exposition scene (105), and at the beginning of the next scene, Clitipho comes on stage addressing Clinia (175).

In the Menaechmi, the Epidamnian Menaechmus, upon being shut out both by his wife and by his love, declares that he will consult his friends (700), but we hear no more of this (cf. 899 ff.).

2. The Resolving Character

In the Andria, Crito, the person through whom the recognition is accomplished, does not actually appear before vs. 796. There is only one phrase, occurring in the exposition, which can possibly be considered preparation for this sudden appearance. Speaking of Chrysis, Simo says:

70 ... ex Andro commigravit huc vicinia,
 inopia et cognatorum neglegentia
 coacta ...

The commentator remarks:

71.2 ET COGNATORVM hic iam parat nos ad Critonis aduentum.

Whether or not the audience would place any significance in such a casual reference is questionable.

The father in the Eunuchus plays a somewhat similarly important role, although he is the last character of the play to

make his entrance (971). Still, his appearance is much more natural than that of Crito simply because he is the father of the two young men of the play, and the only surprizing thing is that his entrance is delayed as long as it is. Yet his entrance receives much more preparation than does that of Crito.¹ When Parmeno first sees Chaerea appear, talking of women and evidently smitten, Parmeno cries:

298 ... o infortunatum senem!

The commentator remarks:

292,2 O INFORTVNATVM SENEM hoc dicto praestruxit ad exitum fabulae ...; nam perturbatus ad Thaidem ingreditur hic senex per fallaciam Pythiae et indicium Parmenonis, atque ita firmabuntur nuptiae uirginis, quam ducet Chaerea.

And after this episode, when he is looking for a place where he may change his clothes and discard his miserable disguise, Chaerea says:

610 ... metuo fratrem
ne intus sit; porro autem pater ne rure redierit iam.

To this Donatus remarks:

611 ... PATER NE RVRE REDIERIT praeparatur iam interuentus senis.

The return of Laches from abroad in the Heros is foreshadowed by the lines of Davus, vss. 45 ff. Laches is the last name in the ancient list of dramatis personae, and may perhaps have been the resolving character (cf. Jensen xix).

The arrival of the husbands in the Stichus is directly foreshadowed when Pamphila asks her sister, Panegyris, to let her know if any message from Panygyris' husband should arrive (148). Panegyris asks Pamphila the same favor (149), and then says:

150 eho, Crocotium, i parasitum Gelasimum huc arcessito,

¹Preparation for the father in the Eunuchus is much more easily and plausibly introduced than any further preparation for Crito in the Andria apparently could be. (Mysis might conceivably deliver the lines which would prepare for the entrance of Crito.)

tecum adduce; nam illum ecastor mittere ad portum uolo,
si quae forte ex Asia naulis heri aut hodie uenerit.
nam dies totos apud portum seruos unus adsidet;
sed tamen uolo interuisi. propera atque actutum redi.

When Pinacium appears on stage with talk of good news, therefore, the audience does not have to wait as long as Pinacium's mistress in order to guess just what the news is (274 ff.).² The husbands are hardly resolving characters in the usual sense, but upon their appearance, the complication of the play vanishes.

The return of Charmides in the *Trinummus* is foreshadowed by the despairing question of his son (589 f.)³ and by the fervent wish of his faithful slave (617 ff., cf. Leo, P.F. 136). On the other hand, Megaronides thinks that to await the arrival of Charmides in order that he himself might give his daughter her dowry would be to delay too long (744 ff.).

²Since Pinacium has been sent to the port to watch for the return of the husbands, Fraenkel (281 ff.; cf. Leo, Nach. d. Goett. Gesell., 1902, p. 381 f.) very much objects to the alleged reason for summoning Gelasimus (150 ff.). I suggest that these lines are inserted merely to foreshadow the arrival of the husbands and to introduce Gelasimus (cf. Au. 696 ff.; Ru. 897 ff.). The excuse given is admittedly weak, but weak motivations are not infrequent. In his effort to prove Plautine botchwork in the introduction of Gelasimus at this point, Fraenkel (286 ff.) raises other objections, especially that 1) Crocotium's unmotivated remaining on scene after vs. 154 is impossible in Attic technique as is also 2) her remaining silent for forty lines while Gelasimus indulges in his monologue; that 3) Gelasimus' entrance has no motivation or explanation, and that 4) his speech is merely a cento of parasite speeches. Elsewhere (Cl. Phil., July, 1933), I have discussed Peri. 160 ff., which in my interpretation is a parallel to the action at this point in the *Stichus*. I point out that in the *Pericliomene*, no matter when Doris appears in this scene (171, 187, or 207), she does so without sufficient motivation, thus offering a parallel for 3). Euripides And. 876 ff. constitutes a precise parallel for 1). Thus on one or two points, Fraenkel's conception of Attic technique is proved to be faulty.

³In his effort to prove that vss. 583-91 are original with Plautus, Jachmann (239 f.) considers Lesbonicus' wish very surprising, and concludes that Plautus inserted it, taking the motif from vss. 617 ff. I see no reason whatever for such an assumption. Lesbonicus, having already squandered all his money and now finding himself in the very embarrassing position of being forced to choose between dishonor and penury, has every reason to wish for the return of his father. His case is entirely different from that of Philolaches, in the *Mostellaria*, whose financial difficulties are a light matter compared with the situation of Lesboni-

The resolving character of the *Asinaria* is *Diabolus*, the rival lover, along with his parasite. Reference to him by name appears only once and that, too, late in the play (634), where *Argyrippus* states that this rival has promised to pay the twenty minae agreed upon for a year's contract. At the time of stating the price, *Cleareta* warned *Argyrippus* that the first to pay the price should have the contract (231), for she had already said that if she did not give her daughter to *Argyrippus*, she would that very night give her to someone else (195). When the play ends, there is still a possibility that this rival may not be eliminated, but that *Argyrippus* may share his mistress as does *Phaedria* in the *Eunuchus* (915 ff.).⁴

The only preparation outside the prologue for the appearance of *Lyconides*, the resolving character of the *Aulularia*, is found in the mention of him made by his slave (603 ff.).

The appearance of *Stalagmus*, the resolving character of

cus. *Philolaches* is still managing to maintain his gay life. Here as in numerous other cases, one cannot escape the conviction that *Plautus* wrote better comedies than the Attic authors as the latter's plays are sometimes reconstructed by *Fraenkel* and *Jachmann*. For instance, *Jachmann* finds in vss. 439-41, a *Plautine* addition. Of course, this necessitates the inclusion of vss. 566-8 in the same category, and *Jachmann* readily concludes that these too are *Plautine*. Besides destroying the sequence which the lines themselves constitute, this assumption removes the lines which make the lie of *Philot* (564) so altogether natural and plausible. In fact, the true explanation of vs. 440, somewhat disconcerting since *Stasimus* does not receive his freedom at the end of the play, may well be that the author is looking forward to the lie of *Philot*. Is it likely that the original poet omitted such niceties, and that they come from the hand of the translator or adapter? If so, then the adapter was an artist of no mean ability. *Jachmann* is also of the opinion that vs. 439 is original with *Plautus* because of the word play in *bene velle* and *bene facere*. This may be so, but we must not overlook the fact that one of the commonest ideas in popular Greek morality -- with which this play is overburdened -- is the contrast between words and deeds.

⁴Cf. also *Truculentus*, and *Legrand*, 281 with authors there cited. The *Asinaria* does not reach a genuine solution: the status of *Argyrippus* as sole lover is not definitely established. It is not absolutely necessary that it should be, but the matter should not be left in uncertainty. Also, the fraud is not discovered and forgiven by *Artemona*.

the Captivi, is foreshadowed in those lines which also foreshadow the recognition of Tyndarus (759 ff.; 875 f.; 881; 887). No explanation is ever offered as to precisely how Stalagmus was apprehended (cf. 1014).⁵

The appearance of Therapontigonus in the Curculio naturally enough receives no direct foreshadowing, unless, perhaps, in a very general way, the story of Curculio and how he slipped away with the soldier's ring while the latter was drunk and asleep (cf. 354 ff.) foreshadows the appearance of the deceived man. Still, it would have been very natural and easily recognizable preparation if Curculio or Phaedromus had expressed apprehensions lest the soldier appear and spoil their intrigue.

The appearance of the soldier in the Epidicus, who resolves one of the errors of the play, is definitely foreshadowed twice. Epidicus mentions him both to Stratippocles (153 ff.) and to Periphanes (299 ff.; cf. 457 ff.) as a good prospective purchaser of Acropolistis, describing the soldier in the first case as a Euboean, in the second as a Rhodian.⁶

⁵The fact that no explanation of the presence of Stalagmus is given may strengthen an assumption that Plautus has suppressed certain details, in the opinion of Legrand (421). Legrand previously remarks (394):

Lorsque Criton d'Andros, dans une des dernières scènes de l'*Andrienne*, apparaît juste à temps pour conjurer une catastrophe imminente, son arrivée, que rien n'annonçait, que rien ne préparait, constitue un vrai coup de théâtre. ... De l'arrivée de Criton d'Andros, je ne trouve à rapprocher que deux autres incidents du répertoire: l'apparition soudaine et opportune d'Hannon dans la dernière partie du *Poenulus*² et celle de Stalagme à la fin des *Captifs*; encore est-il possible que l'apparition de Stalagme, inexpliquée chez Plaute, se soit rattachée chez son modèle à un épisode antérieur.

⁶Jachmann (219 f.) following Dziatzko thinks that in the original, the soldier returned and carried through the purchase of Acropolistis. On the appearance of Philippa, cf. below, sec. III, 2a. On the inconsistency of the native country of the soldier, cf. Geppert, *Plaut. Studien*, Berlin, 1870, pp. 66 f.; Langen, *Plaut. Studien*, pp. 140 f.

Bacchis in the Hecyra is the person through whom the recognition is brought about. She does not appear on stage before vs. 727, but she is brought on altogether naturally, having become, apparently, involved in the situation, and she is repeatedly mentioned in the earlier part of the play. She is the one link--a weak one--that joins the two protatic characters to the plot of the play (cf. 60 ff.). Pamphilus' visits to Bacchis are mentioned in the exposition (157), and again in the body of the play (536 ff.; 554 ff.). Incidentally, it may be noticed that Bacchis denies even these visits in very solemn and sacred language (750 ff.). It is also intimated that Bacchis was unfaithful to Pamphilus (168). Pamphilus refers to Bacchis (294; 407 f.), as do Phidippus (539 ff.) and Laches (684 ff.).

Somewhat similar to the case in the Mostellaria is that found in the Menaechmi, in which Menaechmus Sosicles directs Messenio to return to the courtesan's house for him before sunset (437; cf. 445). His master does not wait for his return, but still, his appearance (966) is a very timely one, and though he does not immediately resolve the plot, he may be called the resolving character since both the Menaechmi appear much too stupid ever to solve the error.

In the Mostellaria, a nice prearrangement of circumstance provides for the entrance of the resolving characters. When Callidamates appears on the stage about to join Philolaches' drinking party, he instructs his slave to come back to Philolaches' house for him in good time (313 f.). The two slaves who come for their master (858; 885), bring about the disillusionment of Theopropides (933 ff.). This type of preparation has no element of foreshadowing, but some of the audience would probably recall Callidamates' instructions when the slaves appear.

The first arrival of Harpax, so timely for the designs of Pseudolus, is repeatedly foreshadowed in the earlier part of the play (57 ff.; 82; 373 ff.; cf. 622 f.). Upon his second appearance (1103), he serves as a resolving character.⁷

a. False Preparation or Notable Lack of Preparation for the Resolving Character⁸

The repeated mention of Saurea, the atriensis who never appears in the Asinaria (cf. 85; 96; 264; 334 ff.), might be misinterpreted as foreshadowing the appearance of the real Saurea,⁹ who might very well have served as the resolving character. He would have been the most natural person to discover the fraud and to report it to Artemona, and although at the end of the play (851) Artemona does learn that twenty minae have been paid to Philaenium, she does not really discover the fraud at all, as she might fairly have been expected to do, as Nausistrata does in the Phormio, especially after the lines:

(LEONIDA) de argento si mater tua sciat ut sit factum --
ARGYRIPPUS heia,
745 bene dicite ...

These lines are false preparation.

There is no preparation for the appearance of Hanno in the Poenulus.

False preparation is found in the Truculentus where the slave declares that he will expose his young master and Phronesium to the old master (306 ff.). After this, we should certainly expect the old master to appear, perhaps as a resolving character, even though Astaphium expresses the hope that she will be able to

⁷The placing of the arrival of Harpax on the morrow is an inconsistency. The Pseudolus has frequently been considered contaminated. Cf. Hough, Composition of the Pseudolus, esp. pp. 51 ff. On the time inconsistency, cf. Pericliomene.

⁸Cf. above note 5.

⁹Cf. Harpax in the Pseudolus.

win over this morose country slave with her various meretricious devices (317 ff.). Without any such attempt, however, Truculentus upon his reappearance is quite a changed man, and he offers no explanation for not having made the exposure (669 ff.).¹⁰

¹⁰Cf. Legrand (378 note 1):

Chez Plaute, le changement d'humeur du truculentus n'est absolument pas motivé.

Donatus, ad Ad. 986.3, remarks:

QVOD TE ISTI FACILEM ET FESTIVVM PVTANT bene in postremo dignitas personae huius seruata est, ne perpetuo commutata uideretur, ut Truculenti apud Plautum. (he Wessner: ut codd.)

Instead of a resolving character, the old master might have been a complicating character. Cf. Philoxenus in the Bacchides, whose intervention is a threatened complication but hardly a realized one.

II. PREPARATION FOR IMPORTANT PHASES OF ACTION

1. Complication

In the Adelphoe, the difficulties in which Aeschinus becomes involved because of his making Ctesipho's case against the slave dealer his own are somewhat foreshadowed. We catch the first hint of the true state of affairs when Micio tells us that not long since Aeschinus said that he wished to marry. Micio was delighted at the young profligate's decision to settle down (150 ff.). We had already been told (91) that he was in love with the slave girl whom he had taken by force from her master. Syrus intimates that the girl is Ctesipho's (252 f.), and in the following scene (254 ff.) the situation is made entirely clear. Ctesipho remarks:

263 ... maledicta famam meum laborem et peccatum in se transtulit.

The commentator says:

263.4 IN SE TRANSTVLIT pulchra παρεσκευή (Stephanus: xxxx C, om. V), qua erratura est Sostrata circa Aeschinum, quemadmodum iam errauit Demea, quod credit ab illo amari meretricem.

It is to be noted that the Sostrata-Canthara scene follows almost immediately (288 ff.), and that the author evidently desired to clear the atmosphere before bringing on this new storm of trouble. In general, the author seems anxious not too much to mystify the spectators: the characters on stage may be involved in any amount of "error" but not the spectators.¹

¹Cf. Legrand, 502, 546 ff. Mere explanations immediately preceding or in the midst of a deception (as asides) are very common in the comedies. For instance, it is necessary to remove Parmeno in the Hecyra, as Pamphilus explains (409 ff.), in order that he may know nothing of the childbirth. This removal is in-

The downfall of the virtuous but weak Pistoclerus in the Bacchides is foreshadowed by his own apprehension of the wiles of the two sisters (51 ff.). The return of all the gold to Nicobulus is foretold by Mnesilochus' statement of his intention (515 ff.).

It is not too much to suppose that the suspicions of the audience were aroused when, in the Eunuchus, the lowly and ineligible Parmeno remarks upon first catching sight of Pamphils:

... papae
230 facie honesta! mirum ni ego me turpiter hodie hic dabo
cum meo decrepito hoc eunucho. haec superat ipsam Thaidem.

This is sufficient to lead us to expect a complication to develop about the girl. The commentator notes this:

230.1 FACIE HONESTA οἰκονομία, qua ostenditur amaturus Chaerea,
si quidem hanc Parmeno ipse miratur.

When Chaerea appears in great consternation, therefore, we suspect that he has fallen in love even before he speaks such lines as the following:²

296 o faciem pulchram! deleo omnis dehinc ex animo mulieres ...

troduced by Pamphilus' merely stating that he must send Parmeno off somewhere (413 f.). Without this explanation, the pretext on which he sends Parmeno off would be as puzzling to the audience as it is to Parmeno. Again, before the complicated scenes of the Amphitruo, the audience is repeatedly forewarned of precisely what is about to take place. Thus Mercury explains his intention before he approaches Sosia (263 ff.; 295; 300 f.), and Sosia explains that he intends to try his adversary by asking questions the answers to which only he himself can possibly know (424 ff.). Likewise, the author is careful to present Alcumena's thoughts and state of mind (633 ff.; 660 ff.) before the scene of misunderstanding between herself and her husband. Amphitruo's state of mind is also presented in a monologue (654 ff., cf. Fraenkel, 238). Thus the misunderstanding and subsequent quarrel is made perfectly plausible and clear. Still again, before the scene in which Juppiter placates Alcumena, he explains his intention (891 ff.; cf. 861 ff.), and she reveals her state of mind (882 ff.). Lastly Mercury explains precisely what he intends to do in order to keep Amphitruo from entering the house (999 ff.). Cf. Au. 713 ff.; 727 ff.; Ba. 35 ff., 1149 ff.; Cap. 219 ff.; Cas. 769 ff.; Epid. 181 ff.; 192 ff.; Men. 831 f.; 1087 ff.; Ru. 1036 ff. No explanation is given before Cas. 621 ff. (cf. Leo, P. F. 133), but cf. Cas. 558 ff.; or before Mer. 426 ff.

²Cf. Ph. 109 ff.; An. 73, 127.

The quarrel between Thraso and Thais also receives considerable preparation.³ This quarrel is of course necessary if Phaedria is to be happily restored to Thais, and it furnishes a considerable amount of the sustaining action. When explaining the situation to Phaedria, Thais hints that Thraso himself has designs upon Pamphila (142 f.). In Donatus, this is interpreted as a subtle and clever invention to disarm Phaedria of his jealousy by making him think that the soldier is really in love with the girl and not with herself:⁴

142 SED EGO QVANTVM SVSPICOR alta et acuta inuentio: scit meretrix amatores hoc solo inimicos esse, quod idem diligunt; magnifice igitur, ut rivalis odium deleniret, uult persuadere Phaedriae non se amari sed uirginem.

143.1 AD VIRGINEM ANIMVM ADIECIT cur hoc inferat? ut uel laeden- di militis causa Phaedria patiatur eum, quam amet et nolit, uirginem dono dare.

But this is not a mere invention of Thais, as is shown by the words of Thraso:

TH. sed heus tu, purgon ego me de istac Thaidi,
435 quod eam me amare suspicatast? GN. nil minus.
immo auge mage suspicionem.

This suspicion and Gnatho's sage advice (435 ff.) on how to make Thais jealous and desirous of his love, is the main device for bringing about the quarrel. Frequent comments in Donatus notice this fact:

434 PVRGON EGO ME DE ISTA THAIDI οἰκονομία ad litem futuram inter militem et Thaidem.

436 IMMO AVGE MAGIS SVSPICIONEM haec erit causa rei-ciendi militis.

440.2 TV PAMPHILAM CONTINVO hic magna οἰκονομία est, qua

³It will be recalled that Thraso is the result of contamination. A corresponding character (i.e., a rival), however, may have been in the original Eunuchus. Cf. Jachmann, Nach. Goett. Gesell., 1921, pp. 70 f.

⁴It is conceivable that the audience might conclude from the words of Thais that a complication was due to arise from these designs of Thraso.

Terentius praeparat, quemadmodum iurgium inter Thaidem militemque et Gnathonem per duas partes serpat fabulae. (suas codd.)

And later when Parmeno intimates that Thraso is too proud to be seen in the streets with his mistress (494 f.), the commentator says:

495.1 VNA IRE CVM AMICA IMPERATOREM IN VIA uide προπαρσκευήν
futuræ litis inter Thaidem ac militem.

And later, at the mere mention of Chremes:

501 SI FORTE HVC CHREMES ADVENERIT οικονομία ad litem futuram
et exitum fabulae. et hoc non audit miles; nam si audiret,
nimis irasceretur.

When the actual quarrel is reported by Dorias, the commentator remarks:

624.2 HEVS INQVIT PVER hic ostenditur, quod supra (III 1, 50
sq.) est apparatus.

Early in the Casina, Olympio describes the vengeance which he intends to take upon Chalinus (115 ff.). This is evidently something more than an idle threat, as the conversation between him and Lysidamus after their victory indicates (437 ff.).⁵

⁵Jachmann (120 f.) makes a mistaken interpretation of this passage, and then proceeds to draw important conclusions from it. He quotes vss. 437-9 as follows:

OL. sine modo rus veniat (sc. Casina): ego remittam ad te
virum
cum furca in urbem tamquam carbonarium
LYS. ita fieri oportet. OL. factum et curatum dabo.

He then remarks:

Das ist hoechst sonderbar: wie kann Lysidamus auf den Vorschlag Olympios antworten ita fieri oportet, wenn er einen ganz anderen Plan, nach dem Casina gar nicht aufs Land hinaus sondern ins Haus des Nachbarn gebracht werden soll, im Kopf und sogar schon zur Ausfuehrung vorbereitet hat (477 ff.)? Als ich noch an die Kontamination der Casina glaubte, ist mir der Einfall gekommen dass in den Κληρούμενοι Olympio mit Casina wirklich in die Villa ziehe.

It certainly is "sonderbar!" Of course the lines must refer to Chalinus, not to Casina, and in the next line, the mention of Chalinus' name does not indicate a change of subject, but simply continues: "I had determined to send Chalinus ..." (i.e., even

Lysidamus has already expressed threats of his own (299). All these threats eventually come to naught, but the vengeance which their adversaries swear find abundant fruition. Cleustrata is

before Olympio requested it). "Virum" is not in apposition with "te," but the object of the verb. We should expect to have the object expressed with such a dependent phrase as "cum furca." Since the meter is senarii, it would be perverse to take this prepositional phrase only with "carbonarium." But above all, the sense of Jachmann's interpretation is absolutely impossible because of the attitude of the two men towards Casina elsewhere. Further, once Casina arrived in the country, Lysidamus would not want her returned. He arranges the retreat in his neighbor's house merely because, like Zeus in the story (Iliad 14. 153 ff. esp. 330 ff.) to which Plato objected (Republic 390 BC): he cannot wait until they get to the country (and it would spoil the play if he did). Cf. Cas. 485; 782 f. The situation in the Adelphoe (845 ff.) is entirely different. Sending the town slave to the country is a well known type of punishment (cf. Mo. 4; 17 ff., 55 ff.). After reaching these conclusions, I find that Ussing refers these lines to Chalinus, not Casina (ad v. 416):

... si Chalinus in villam ad se et Casinam venerit, se eum
cum furca ...

Elsewhere Jachmann's careless interpretations and the conclusions which he is willing to draw from them are shocking. For example, he (92) remarks on Ru. 725:

Labrax droht wenig spaeter (725) equidem istas iam ambas educam foras -- wie will er denn die Maedchen h e r a u s f uehren, sie befinden sich ja nicht in einem Innenraum sondern draussen, naemlich an dem Altar vor dem Venustempel. Sollte sich Diphilos unzutreffend ausgedrueckt haben? Das ist wenig wahrscheinlich. Oder hat Plautus ungenau uebersetzt? Auch das will nicht einleuchten, denn er wusste doch gewiss zu unterscheiden zwischen 'heraus' und 'davon', wie immer der Begriff im Griechischen ausgedrueckt gewesen sein moege, und an einer spaeteren Stelle der Szene (760) laesst er den Kuppler ja auch ganz richtig sagen utramque iam mecum abducam simul. Wir wollen also auch hier den Wortlaut so nehmen wie er dasteht,...

It is not necessary that the girls be inside a room in order for "foras" to be used correctly. Any well defined locality is sufficient, as the following line proves (Men. 988; cf. Cap. 60):

... ex hoc saltu dammi saluom ut educam foras.
(ute duo anfora cod.)

Similarly, when Jachmann (7) finds a verbal contradiction in Ru. 1192-6 in the use of optatum and improviso, he does so by misinterpreting the former word. That something desired can befall one unexpectedly is obvious. A passage which disproves Jachmann's contention is found in the Eunuchus:

... an ego occasionem

determined that her husband shall have no dinner (149 f.; 155 f.).⁶ The seriousness of this vengeance is brought home to the audience by the remarks of Lysidamus and, especially, by those of Olympio (490 ff.; 724 f.; 743 ff.; 801 ff.; cf. 763 ff.); but Cleustrata carries the day (772 ff., especially 775 f.; 788 f.). Cleustrata has even more serious vengeance in store (155 ff.; 559 ff.; 589 f.), as does Chalinus, also (504 ff.): he will tell his mistress the plot which he has discovered. Even Alcesimus makes remarks of evil omen (528; 606 ff.).

In the Mercator, the report of Demipho's discovery of Pasicompsa is anticipated by the last lines of Charinus' prologue-monologue (107 ff.). Charinus no sooner tells us that he desires to keep his father from discovering her than he sees approaching

605 mi ostentam, tantam, tam brevem, tam optatam, tam insperatam amitterem?

Cf. on Cas. 198, below, sec. II, 2 a, n. 27.

⁶The true state of affairs with regard to the interest of Lysidamus in the marriage of Casina and his wife's suspicions of the fact as revealed in the prologue (51 ff., cf. Fraenkel 210; 294 ff.), is set forth early in the play by Cleustrata (152 ff.; 195a) and by Lysidamus himself (227; 339; cf. 365 ff.; 449 ff.). Still, Chalinus is laboring under an error even after the lots are drawn (429 ff.; 454-68), and is enlightened only at vs. 468. It is somewhat surprizing that Chalinus suffers under this error since the other principals of the play seem to have been quite familiar with the true state of affairs (but cf. 51). The gross language of this scene (e.g., 455; cf. 909 ff.) and the probable actions of Lysidamus accompanying them furnish some justification for the inference that this part of the scene (i.e., the error) is inserted as a deliberate appeal to the pit. In this connection, it is to be recalled that Diphilus was the "naughty" member of the New Comedy triad of geniuses. Cf. Ru. 429; Athenaeus 451 B; also the title, *Paederastae*. In the face of this evidence, I do not understand how Jachmann (58, ad Ru. 1074 f.) can say:

Nebenbei bemerkt stimmt auch die paederastische Zweideutigkeit der V. 1074-75 zu der Beurteilung der Stelle, wie sie sich fuer unbefangene Betrachtung eigentlich von selbst ergibt, denn sie ist mehr im Stil des Plautus als in dem der *νέα κωμωδία*.

New Comedy is not precisely the same thing with all authors. Later, Jachmann (102) notices Diphilus' fondness for bold low jests.

the slave whom he had ordered to stay at the boat. He forebodes bad news, and we can readily guess what that bad news is, although some seventy lines pass before the slave actually makes his report (180 f.). Later in the play, Lysimachus foretells his quarrel with Demipho (797 ff.).

In the *Trinummus*, the proposed marriage of the daughter of Charmides is foreshadowed when Callicles explains to Megaronides that he is guarding the treasure against the return of his friend, and that if something should happen to Charmides meanwhile, he will be able to furnish the daughter with a dowry and find a suitable marriage for her (156 ff.). More important than the actual foreshadowing is the fact that after this explanation, the audience can enjoy the quarrel about the dowry, knowing that this is merely much ado about nothing.

Not having either an intrigue or a recognition, the *Aulularia* is not very rich in preparation. One of the main events of the play is the loss of the pot of gold. Euclio's apprehension, repeatedly stressed, foreshadows this loss (66; 79 ff.; 105 ff.; 464 ff.). One might expect that the cooks would steal the gold, for their reputation for thievery plays an important part in light comedy scenes (322 ff.). On the other hand, this is a commonplace wherever cooks are concerned. The suspicions of Euclio at Megadorus' advances (184 ff.; 460 ff.; 570 ff.), while quite in keeping with Euclio's character, are nevertheless specifically prepared for:⁷

nam nunc quom celo sedulo omnis ne sciant,
omnes uidentur scire et me benignius
115 omnes salutant quam salutabant prius;
adeunt, consistunt, copulantur dexteras,
rogitant me ut ualeam, quid agam, quid rerum geram

Incidentally, these suspicions become mutual (cf. 204 ff.; 244 ff.)

⁷Cf. *Eun.* 553 ff.

and lead to amusing "responsive" accusations (220 ff.; 252 f.).

The successful deception of Hegio in the *Captivi* receives some preparation. Ergasilus says that the business of buying captives is quite foreign to Hegio's nature (99). Hegio's own apprehensions of the escape of his captives (115 ff.) are significant, especially the following lines:

255 qui cauet ne decipiatur vix cauet quam etiam cauet
etiam quom cauuisse ratus est saepe is cautor captus est.

Hegio's discovery of the deception and of the disguise of Tyndarus is variously foreshadowed. The other captives whom Hegio has bought are mentioned early in the play (126 f.; 458; 508 ff.), thus preparing for the appearance of Aristophontes. The possibility of the deception's being discovered, and the danger under which Tyndarus is being left -- both are repeatedly stressed (222 ff.; 349; 435 f.; 516 ff.).

a. False Preparation or Notable Lack of Preparation for Complication

The condition of Phaedria in the *Aulularia* and her approaching deliverance are revealed at the opening of the play (74 ff.), and again later (275 ff.). The thought uppermost in the mind of the old nurse in both passages is that of fear lest Euclio discover this condition.⁸ Note also the following lines:

238 EVC. at nihil est dotis quod dem. ME. ne duas.
dum modo morata recte ueniat, dotata est satis.

The deliverance is accomplished, however, without the exposure.

In the *Hecyra*, the childbirth comes as a complete surprise (361 ff.). Philumena's illness is repeatedly referred to,⁹ but hints are thrown out that the sickness may be a mere pretext (188; 238 ff.; 320 ff.), and the girl's father Phidippus merely says

⁸Cf. the *Samia*.

⁹*Hec.* 188; 238; 320 ff.; 336 ff.; 349 ff.

that she swore that she could not live with Laches and Sostrata in the absence of Pamphilus (267 ff.). The audience, therefore, is led to believe that there is certainly something suspicious about the illness, and perhaps, that there is no illness at all, but merely a quarrel. It is dramatically necessary, of course, for the two old men to believe that there is no illness, but that there is merely a quarrel and hard feelings. Perhaps the Greek original had an expository prologue which revealed the true state of affairs.¹⁰

The jealous suspicions of Daemones' wife are told by Daemones himself in the Rudens (895 f.), and are later deftly used to motivate the entrance of Daemones and the girls (1045 ff.). One might have been justified in expecting more serious consequences, especially if he recalled the parts of jealous wives in the Phormio, Asinaria, Casina, Menaechmi, and Mercator.¹¹

¹⁰On the omission of the expository prologues in Terence, its purpose and its results, cf. Frank, AJP xlix (1928), 316.

¹¹Earlier in the play, Daemones very naturally explains that it is impossible for anyone to sacrifice at the temple of Venus next door without his knowing it, since they always come to his house for fire or water or to borrow some utensil (131 ff.). So when Ampelisca later comes to his house for water, her action is made entirely plausible, and the poet's dramatic purpose is discreetly veiled (331 ff.). Jachmann is unstinting in his praise of the motivation of vss. 331 ff. in the light of vss. 133 ff. He states (71):

Diphilos hatte echtes Theaterblut, und was ihn auszeichnet ist gerade der Reichtum in der Erfindung lebenswahrer Motive, durch die er die Handlung ungezwungen vorwaertsfuehrt und fortentwickelt.

The motivation of 1045 ff. in the light of 895 f. would appear to be precisely parallel and quite in keeping with the jealous wife of New Comedy (cf. Legrand, 155). But not so to Jachmann (75): this is all unnatural and senseless.

... Daedalis duerfte ihren kreuzbraven Mann, dessen besondere pietas anerkannt ist, hinlaenglich kennen, um ihm nich zuzutrauen dass er sich zwei Kebsen ins Haus naehme, -- minime istuc faciet noster Demones (1245) haette er auf eine solche Verdaechtigung mit Fug entgegen koennen.

For all his pietas, "our Daemones" is careful to note that the

2. Recognition

One of the most easily recognized types of preparation is that which prepares for the recognition of a character. When this

girls are young and good-looking (894). Jachmann is somewhat prone to sentimentality in such matters (cf. Jachmann, 9, 218). Still, Jachmann (77) is generous enough in praising Plautus for the prae-paratio:

Allein damit hat sich Plautus nicht begnuegt: er hat eine Vorbereitung fuer noetig erachtet und sie auf seine Weise in dem Monolog des Demones geschaffen. Diese Vorsorge von langer Hand beweist ein Mass von planvoller Ueberlegung und gewissenhafter Muehewaltung, die bei Plautus zu finden uns aufs hoechste erstaunt und der wir eine gewisse relative Anerkennung nicht versagen wollen -- 'magna oeconomia' koennten wir es im Stil antiker Kunstkritik nennen.

In a footnote on this passage, he remarks that such would be less striking in Terence, and refers to his own treatment of the Eunuchus (Nachr. Goetting. Ges., 1921, p. 88). I find other objections to Jachmann's consideration of Daemones' monologue, vss. 892-905. In the first place, this monologue, however striking, cannot be isolated from similar monologues, and none of these can be considered without some notice of the economy of roles in actual production. (After writing this, I find that Prescott (TAPA, 1932) has anticipated my point by some months.) Secondly, Jachmann (79) says that vss. 897-901 prepare for a meeting between Daemones and Gripus, although Daemones deliberately returns into the house. He remarks (79):

Das wirkt so wie wenn eine Tuer vor jemand zuvorkommend und einladend geoeffnet, im Augenblick jedoch wo er eintreten will, ihm vor der Nase zugeschlagen wird.

Jachmann may think whatever he chooses about the aesthetic fitness of such action, but when he implies that it is not legitimate action in New Comedy, he is quite wrong. This is an established mode of introducing a character. Au. 696 ff. is a precise parallel, as is also Hec. 280. Cf. St. 150 ff. Certain points introduced against another monologue of Daemones (1191-1204) are also objectionable. Jachmann contends (5 f.) that Daemones' talk of kinship with Plesidippus is a false note, since Trachalio knows nothing of the kinship and so could not reveal it to Daemones. Jachmann (5f.) makes it plain that he does not like explanations inferred from unreported conversations, etc., and this is his privilege; but when he says that the inconsistency cannot be explained by such an inference here, he overlooks the very simplest fact. Of course Trachalio did not know about the kinship between Daemones and his master, but we can safely assume that he knew the name of his master's father and his deme. It is probable that this would be the very first information that Daemones would request, and given these facts, Daemones himself immediately recognizes the kinship. This appears to me a very simple and altogether satisfactory explanation, and we know from a subsequent line that Daemones and Trachalio did have a conversation in the house

character is a girl, such preparation often takes the form of assurances of her good moral character and perhaps hints as to her decent birth.¹ Thus, in the Andria, Glycerium is the supposed sister of Chrysis (124), but from the very beginning of the play, hints as to her virtuous character and her Athenian birth are thrown out. With reference to Chrysis, Simo in the expository scene² says that she was poor and that she lived an honest, hard-working life when she first came to Athens, spinning and weaving (71 ff.).³ Donatus remarks:

before Daemones came upon the stage (1217; cf. 1182, if assigned to Trachalio). Or it might be more likely that Palaestra would have identified Pleusicles as akin to her and hence to her father. Jachmann (18) claims that vs. 1217 is also Plautine botchwork, on the grounds that Daemones, not owning Trachalio, could not make such a promise! Syrus in the Adelphoe does not belong to Demea, but Demea delivers an opinion that he thinks Syrus should be freed, and his opinion carries the day (959 ff.). Cf. Demea's promise, vss. 886 ff. Jachmann (6 f.; 14; 16; 30; 100) draws important conclusions from the false assumption that Daemones could not properly know of the kinship at this time. A possible inconsistency which Jachmann does not mention may be found in the fact that Daemones addresses Trachalio by name, vs. 1177. But Trachalio's name has nowhere previously been mentioned while Daemones was on stage. It is precisely this line (1177) that Jachmann (31) seizes upon as the beginning of further Plautine originality. Perhaps the prolific Attic writer made a slight mistake, or perhaps Plautus omitted the name somewhere. The inconsistency is mainly interesting because similar inconsistencies can be found elsewhere (e.g., MI. 900). Again, I do not understand how Jachmann (44 f.) can base any argument for Plautine originality on Ru. 1113 f. without first demonstrating that these lines cannot be explained by the rule of "three speaking actors." To be sure, this rule is frequently broken in Plautus and Terence, and it may have no bearing whatever on the present passage, but the lines immediately remind one of awkwardly motivated silences in Greek tragedy.

¹This of course is not character description in the usual sense. Cf. below, note 7.

²This scene is the result of contamination according to Donatus (14).

³The basic eligibility requirements for the bride of a gentleman in Athens at the time of Menander seem to be stated in a fragmentary passage in the Citharista (84 ff. The text is not certain.): free birth, good family, and chastity. When Gilbert Norwood (Plautus and Terence, p. 12) gives a "composite photograph" of the stories of the plays of Plautus and Terence, he combines elements which are nowhere combined in a play (with the possible exception of the Rudens):

71.1 INOPIA ET COGNATORUM N. laude impertita eius moribus, qui mox ducet uxorem, superest ut futurae quoque matronae, id est Glycerio, probitatem debitam pro persona reddat. quae quia honesta numquam esse poterit, si sic eam constet ante nuptias impudice eductam esse, partim defendenda partim etiam laudanda est Chrysis, cum qua commorata est. quam quoniam necesse est meretricem fateri, in condicione turpissimi nominis mulierum sumitur excusatio uoluntatis.

75.6 LANA ET T. V. Q. artificiose, ut uideatur pudice apud eam futura mater familias educi posse, quam meretricem necessitas fecit.

Further on in his story (119 ff.; cf. 286), Simo emphasizes the fact that Glycerium appeared to him to be a paragon of modesty and beauty:

... et vultu, Sosia,
120 adeo modesto, adeo venusto ut nil supra.

All this is not without significance, as the commentator points out:

119.3 ET VVLTV SOSIA ADEO M. quid hic deest, ut eam nurum dignetur Simo nisi sola cognitio? et formam probat in puella Pamphili pater et matronalem modestiam miratur in vultu et uenustatem stupet. nonne ergo iam cernimus hoc praestruxisse Terentium, ut cum Chremetis filiam esse cognouerit, Simo hanc potius eligat quam Philumenam nurum? quamuis ex sororia pulchritudine et ex amore Charini et Dauli laudatione decoram ipsam quoque prope demonstrauerit nobis. 4 ET VVLTV SOSIA haec laus adiuvat post cognitionem futuram nurum. (on praestruxisse, cf. above, p. 5, note 18.)

It is not too much to suppose that the audience caught the significance of details and immediately recognized the heroine of the play.⁴ But there are even more obvious hints. In explaining

"A young Athenian is in love with a charming but friendless girl who is the purchased slave of a leno, or professional procurer. This man is either already hiring her out to anyone who will pay, or is on the point of selling her to some unpleasant person, usually a military officer (the famous miles). ... all is put right by a sudden revelation that the heroine is really of Athenian birth ... and can therefore marry the hero."

The importance of chastity in such cases is noticed by Jachmann (Nach. Goett. Gesell., 1921, p. 81). He attributes this not to a romantic motive (so Thiele, Hermes XXXVIII, 1913, 540) but to morality. Cf. Legrand, 393.

⁴On the audience's grasp of subtle effects, cf. the remarks of Flickinger (The Greek Theater and Its Drama³, p. 316):

Pamphilus' mad determination to acknowledge the child which Glycerium is about to bear, Davos (220 ff.) quite naturally reveals a certain story about Glycerium's being an Attic citizen. Such talk he dismisses as utter nonsense. Donatus remarks:

220.1 ET FINGVNT QVANDAM et argumenti partem narrat et non credit factum esse quod dicit, ut supersit errori locus.

221.1 FVIT QVIDAM OLIM SENEX MERCATOR modo totius summae argumentum populo narratur, sed ut restet aliquid ad errorem, abrogatur fides.
(modo: non T)

The mere mention of citizenship in such a case, however, probably constituted definite foreshadowing for a considerable part of the audience, since such mention occurs so frequently before a recognition.⁵ Glycerium's education as a respectable person is later mentioned several times (274; 288). Again the commentator is aware of the significance:

274.1 BENE ET PVDICE EIVS DOCTVM hic illud soluitur (I 1, 48) 'lana et tela uictum quaeritans', ut hoc praestruat b e n e e t p u d i c e Glycerium esse eductam; <nam> 'lana et tela uictum quaeritans' non pertinet ad argumentum, nisi propter uitam Glycerii intellegas.

It is important to note also that the audience is told that Glycerium cherished Pamphilus and only him (293 f.). As the recognition is approached, the report of her Attic citizenship is

"First, audiences exercise a sort of clairvoyance in looking beneath the bare words and divining the course of events, so that (paradoxical as it sounds) the surprises of the stage usually are long foreseen by the spectators and only the expected events happen. Secondly, the dénouement here in question, the discovery that Pamphilus' sweetheart is the daughter of free parents and, in particular, of someone among the dramatic personae, was so hackneyed in New Comedy, occurring in no less than five of Terence's six plays, that any frequent theatergoer would have been on the lookout for it and might easily have recognized any subtle effects dependent thereon."

These remarks are made with especial reference to An. 247; cf. Euripides, Alc. 1102. See also the remark of Donatus, 71.2, considered below, and the remarks of Fraenkel and Jachmann on rings, below, note 27.

⁵Cf. Eu. 108 ff.; Ph. 114 f.; Cur. 490 f.; Ru. 738 ff.

again and again mentioned (778 ff.; 833; 859; 875; 892), especially after the appearance of Crito (796) when the main problem becomes the actual identity of her parents.⁶

The recognition of Selenium in the Cistellaria is foreshadowed by presenting her as a girl altogether qualified from the moral point of view for becoming the wife of a citizen.⁷ Most of this presentation is contained in the speeches of Selenium herself. She remarks that Gymnasium's mother might have done much better if she had married her daughter off instead of driving her to prostitution (42). The mother turns this into a joke, and Gymnasium herself is presented as a typical member of the profession, well satisfied with her mode of life. The following lines between Selenium and the procuress are significant, especially where it is brought out that Selenium has never been intimate with anyone except Alcesimarchus:

77 SEL. ... quom ego illum unum mi exoptavi quicum aetatem degerem.

LE. matronae magi' conducibilest istuc, mea Selenium, unum amare et cum eo aetatem exigere quoi nuptast semel.

83 SEL. ... quia ego nolo me meretricem dicier ...

86 LE. ... sed tu enumquam cum quiquam uiro consueuisti? SELENIVM nisi quidem cum Alcesimarcho, nemine, nec pudicitiam lammuit meam mihi quisquam alius. ...

⁶It can hardly be considered false preparation or even a disconcerting note when Simo twice refers to Chremes' unicam natam (100; 540).

⁷It is to be noted that this description of character is not characterization for dramatic purposes in the usual sense of the term. Selenium might well have never appeared on the stage at all: the description would nevertheless have been given just as it is given in the Phormio, Andria, etc. Quite different is the presentation of Bacchis in the Hecyra as an unusually decent courtesan (Hec. 727 ff.; cf. Donatus, 727.1) in order that her action in the play may appear entirely plausible. In the Hecyra, there is not the slightest hint that Bacchis is fit to become the wife of a citizen. That such description of character foreshadowing recognition is designed for the audience is shown by the fact that it is included in the prologue (173) and that neither Phanestrata nor Demipho makes any inquiries or receives any assurance of the girl's character (cf. 564).

Selenium then proceeds to tell how Alcesimarchus insinuated himself into the favors of such a virtuous young lady, ending with the statement that he promised her in the presence of her mother. that he would marry her (98 f.).⁸ Another unmistakable sign of virtue is Selenium's disregard for her personal appearance now that her one lover has betrayed her (55; 113 ff.).⁹ The fact that this disregard is unusual with her (55) cannot be construed against her: even the most virtuous girl is careful of her appearance when she knows that her lover will see her. In the opening scene, the "mother" of Selenium is repeatedly mentioned by the procuress (38) and by Selenium herself (83; 92; 101; 105).¹⁰ But the procuress very soon informs the audience that Selenium is not really the daughter of this woman, Melaenis (123 ff.). How deliberate the poet's intention is in this speech may be seen from the closing lines:

147 ... si quid usus uenerit,
meminisse ego hanc rem uos uolo.

The true parentage, besides being revealed in the internal prologue (156 ff.),¹¹ becomes evident with the narration of Lampadio to his mistress (549 ff.; cf. 745 ff.). Melaenis, overhearing this account, reveals her intention of returning Selenium to her family of her own accord and before she is forced to do so (628 ff.). No mention of tokens is made until late in the play (635 ff.).

⁸Alcesimarchus confirms this statement (241 ff.; 485 #), and swears that he will not marry the girl whom his father has chosen (497 f.).

⁹This might possibly be construed as a mere sign of grief. But cf. *Hea.* 285 ff. and *Ph.* 104 ff.

¹⁰But Selenium addresses Melaenis as "mother" even after she has been told of her true identity (639 f.).

¹¹Leo (edition ad vss. 125 et 130-132) has pointed out that vss. 125-132 seem to have been inserted into the speech of the procuress in order that the prologue might be omitted.

In the *Epitrepontes*, *Syriscus*' hints as to the possibility of the child's being recognized as of noble birth and the cases of recognition which he cites (103 ff.), foreshadow the recognition of the child. The very existence of tokens in a play is suggestive of recognition (29 ff.), and especially the existence of a ring;¹² so when *Onesimus* identifies the ring as that of his master, the father of the child is practically established (176). He says that his master lost the ring at the *Tauropolia* (234 ff.), and later *Habrotonon* in turn relates her story of an incident which happened at the *Tauropolia* (255 ff.). From these two versions, the audience can draw inferences, and so can foresee the recognition. This is one of the most subtle types of foreshadowing and is found in several plays, all by *Menander*.¹³ *Habrotonon* suggests that *Charisius* may not after all be the guilty party (285 ff.), but this alternative, although plausible enough in real life, in a play of the New Comedy is such a remote possibility that it is not taken seriously by the audience.

In the *Eunuchus*, the citizenship of *Pamphila* is revealed when *Thais* tells *Phaedria* in the presence of *Parmeno* that she thinks *Pamphila* is an Attic citizen, but that she does not know for sure (108 ff.). *Donatus* remarks:

110.2 ARBITROR bene 'arbitror' et nihil certi: quomodo enim ausurus esset *Parmeno* adornare *Chaeream* ad uitandam uirginem, si praescisset ciuem esse?

The girl has commonly been considered the sister of the courtesan, *Thais*, but here again, her education as a respectable person is stressed (116 f.; 748), her chastity is assured (143 f., cf. 434

¹²Cf. below, note 27.

¹³Cf. *Eu.* 115 and 519 (*Sunium*); *Hea.* 96 and 600, 629 (*Corinthus*).

ff.), and her beauty as well (132; 229 f.; 296; 313 ff.). Her parentage, also, receives notice (146 f.; 203 f., cf. 521 ff.; 805 f.; 890; 952). In the passage vss. 521 ff., Chremes, the supposed brother of the girl, expresses skepticism over the possible finding of his sister, whom he thinks dead, although he is laboring under the delusion that Thais herself intends to pose as his sister.¹⁴ Hints as to Pamphila's true identity are also found in her age, which is precisely that of Chremes' lost sister (318 and 526), and in the fact that she was stolen from Sunium, where Chremes possesses a farm (115 and 519). Some slight preparation is made for the appearance of the old nurse, Sophrona, who accomplishes the actual recognition. Chremes in the entrance monologue where he is discussing the possible designs of Thais, says that one of the questions which Thais asked him at their first meeting was whether there was anyone who could recognize the girl (523). Later, during the "siege" scene, Chremes announces to Thais that he is going to fetch Sophrona (807 f.). Only late in the play are tokens mentioned (753; 767).¹⁵ Donatus considers vs. 620 also preparation for the recognition:

ID FACIEBAT RETINENDI ILLIVS CAVSA admonet spectatorem, ne existimet altero rivali inuriam fieri Phaedriae. et simul hic *προπαρρησκουή* est uirginis agnoscendae.

As early as vss. 203 ff., however, Thais has revealed her intention of questioning the supposed brother of Pamphila.

Certain lines of the Georgus (58 f.), wherein it is said that Myrrhina's son has cared for Cleaenetus as if for his own

¹⁴Cf. the skepticism of Phaedria, vss. 155 ff.

¹⁵A slight bit of false preparation is found here if Thais directs Chremes to show the trinkets to the soldier (767), as she does in the interpretation of Jackmann (*Nach. Goett. Gesell.*, 1921, p. 73), since Chremes does no such thing when the soldier actually appears. Jackmann finds the explanation of this inconsistency in the botchwork of contamination. For a similar inconsistency, cf. Po. 732 ff.

father, may be dramatic irony or may possibly hint that Cleaenetus actually is his father.¹⁶

In the Heauton, there is elaborate preparation for the recognition of Antiphila. In vss. 96 f., she is referred to as the daughter of the old woman from Corinth, and the relationship is not questioned. Similarly in vs. 233, the old woman is called her mother. But shortly afterwards, it is flatly stated that the old woman was not her mother at all (269 ff.). Later Syrus calls the girl the daughter of the old woman from Corinth, but this is simply a lie necessitated by his intrigue (600 ff.). His repetition of "Corinth" is especially effective since Sostrata in the next scene tells Chremes that she gave the girl whom she had borne to an old woman from Corinth (629). Clitipho describes the character of Antiphila and contrasts it with that of Bacchis:

225 nam hic Clinia ...

habet bene et pudice eductam, ignaram artis meretriciae.

Bacchis herself praises Antiphila (381 ff.), revealing the fact that Antiphila is the type that loves only one at a time (392).

The report of Syrus as to the precise condition in which Antiphila was found is very significant, as Syrus points out (cf. 246 ff.):

hic sciri potuit aut nusquam alibi, Clinia,
280 quo studio vitam suam te absente exegerit,
ubi de improvisost interventum mulieri.
nam ea res dedit tum existumandi copiam
cotidianae vitae consuetudinem,
quae quoi(u)sque ingenium ut sit declarat maxume.

285 texentem telam studiose ipsam offendimus,
mediocriter vestitam veste lugubri

...
sine auro; tum ornatam ita uti quae ornantur sibi,
nulla mala re esse expolitam muliebri;
290 capillu' pexu' prolixus circum caput

¹⁶Cf. Fraenkel, 314, note 3:

... Dafuer, dass Kleainetos der Vater des bei ihm arbeitenden Juenglings ist, scheint mir immer noch der eigentuemlich ausfuehrliche Ausdruck V. 59 zu sprechen ... -- das ist sehr viel huebscher, wenn hier in Wahrheit der Sohn den unerkannten Vater

relectu' neglegenter; pax. ...

297(^{CLIT.}) scin hanc quam dicit sordidatam et sordidam?
magnum hoc quoque signumst dominam esse extra noxiam,
quom eius tam negleguntur internuntii.

Such details are too conventional to be mistaken,¹⁷ and when Sostrata appears on stage talking of an "anulus" and a "gnata" (614 ff.), the recognition is practically accomplished.

Little is left of the Heros, but it contains one of the best examples among the new fragments of "honest character" preparation such as that found so frequently in the Roman comedies. Davus describes the girl with whom he has fallen in love as ἀκάκος (19) and πάνυ ... ἐλευθέριος καὶ κοσμίᾳ (39 f.). He also gives assurance that he has made no personal advances to the girl (40 ff.). With regard to the parentage of the girl, it is noteworthy that Davus does not reveal the relationship to Tibius as a matter of which he has any personal knowledge: he merely repeats what Tibius claimed to be the fact.

Thrasonides in a famous fragment of the Misumenos (336 K) says that although the girl captive is within his house and in his power, and although he greatly desires her, he does not take her.

In the Pericliomene, Glycera's beauty (prol. 23 f.; 269 ff.) and her good character (150 f.; cf. 301 ff.; 430) are mentioned, preparing for her recognition and marriage as an Attic citizen. Her good character and honest upbringing are not stressed in the extant fragments as much as usual in the Menandrian plays, perhaps because it is plain that she is freeborn (prol.; 185), and has never been the mistress of anyone besides Polemo (prol. 8 ff.; 237 ff.). In the extant fragments, there is little or no

pflegt, was der Zuschauer, als die Worte gesprochen werden, schon weiss oder ahnt.

¹⁷Cf. Ph. 104 ff.; Cl. 55; 113 ff.; Tibullus, I 3, 91 f.

preparation for the recognition of Glycera and Moschio as the children of Pataecus (cf. prol. 43 ff.; 320 ff.).

The recognition of Planesium in the Curculio receives elaborate preparation, especially in the repeated references to her chastity. Perhaps reassurances on this point are more necessary than usual since the girl is the slave of a pander and lives in his house.¹⁸ In the exposition, Phaedromus intimates that the girl has not yet entered upon a professional career when he says that the pander wishes to make a courtesan of her (46; cf. 25 f.). Then in answer to a question of his slave, he states that as far as he is concerned, the girl is as chaste as if she were his sister except for that small part of virtue which has been lost in kissing (51 f.). The conversation continues:

- 57 PH. at illa est pudica neque dum cubitat cum uiris.
PA. credam, pudor si quouquam lenoni siet.
PH. immo ut illam censes? ...

Here the incredulity of the slave, Palinurus, is hardly to be taken seriously, and is somewhat invalidated by Phaedromus' relating the illness of the pander (cf. 698 ff.). Later, when Curculio is leading Planesium away, the pander, Cappadox, remarks:

- 517 ... quaeso ut hanc cures bene siet isti.
bene ego istam eduxi meae domi et pudice....

Even after the recognition, Planesium intervenes in Cappadox' behalf by saying:

- 697 frater, opsecro te, noli hunc condemnatum perdere.
bene et pudice me domi habuit.

On this point, then, the author dwells with insistent emphasis. But there is still other preparation for the recognition. When the parasite is leading the girl out of the house, the banker,

¹⁸The same state of affairs prevails in the *Poenulus* and in the *Rudens*, however, with little emphasis on the girl's chastity in the former and no assurance whatever in the latter play.

Lyco, reminds Cappadox:

490 LY. memento promississe te, si quisquam hanc liberali
caussa manu adsereret, mihi omne argentum redditum eiri,
minas triginta. CA. meminero, de istoc quietus esto.

These lines foreshadow the recognition of Planesium as a free born girl, and also pave the way for the tempestuous scene at the end, especially vss. 666-70 and 709 ff. Still further foreshadowing is found in the monologue of Cappadox, where he relates that he bought the girl when she was a little tot and that he has never seen the man who sold her to him since (528 ff.). Shortly before the recognition, Planesium herself says that she was born free (607), and in the argument over her possession, this is repeated (615; 620). The soldier's ring, when first introduced (346 ff.; cf. 584), can hardly have foreshadowed anything more than the intrigue and, possibly, the appearance of the soldier,¹⁹ but it is a prearranged means of bringing about the recognition, as becomes clear shortly before the recognition takes place (595; 601; 629).

The single extant fragment from the Plautine Dyscolus, a title which survives for Menander and for Mnesimachus, may have been preparation for recognition:

Virgo sum: nondum didici nupta uerba dicere.

The recognition of Telestis in the Epidicus is foreshadowed in the usual way. When she is first mentioned (by the armour-bearer), she is described as:

43 ... forma lepida et liberali captiuam adolescentulam
de praeda ...

More significant foreshadowing is contained in the conversation between Stratippocles and Chaeribulus:

107 CH. ... captiuam genere prognatam bono ... (probo var. lect.
in P)

¹⁹ But note Jachmann's (119 f.) conjecture on the recognition in the Casina (cf. 709), considered below, note 27.

110(ST.) at pudicitiae eius numquam nec uim nec uitium attuli. This last line appears to be the assurance of the girl's chastity which we have come to expect in cases where the girl is to be recognized as a citizen.²⁰ When Philippa appears, she of course reveals the fact that her daughter has been captured (532; 562) and that she has been bought by a citizen of Athens (602 f.). This is sufficient to establish the probability in the minds of the audience that the captive whom Stratippocles has bought is actually the daughter of his father and Philippa. When the girl appears on stage she is described as "pretty as a picture" (623 f.).

The recognition in the Hecyra consists of establishing the identity of the man who has ravished Philumena before her marriage. In reality, this is her husband, but neither of the two knows this fact. Of citizenship, therefore, there is no question. Myrrina tells of Philumena's being ravished (572 ff.) and mentions the fact that a ring was taken away from her at the time (574). In the next line, she mentions Pamphilus in an entirely different connection. This might possibly be considered a hint as to the identity of the man who ravished Philumena.²¹ It certainly reveals

²⁰Legrand (188, note 4) considers Epid. 110 f. probably added by the Latin poet (taking for granted the hypothesis of Dziatzko (cf. below sec. III, 2 a)), or if, in the Greek original, Stratippocles had not yet possessed Telestis, Legrand thinks that it was because, like Phaedromus in the Curculio (cf. 51), he had not yet succeeded in seducing her. The present study presents ample evidence that assurance that the girl to be recognized is either virgin or femina unius viri is customary. While the latter alternative may have been chosen in the original of the Epidicus, I see no reason for assuming that it was. These lines certainly cannot be used to support the hypothesis of Dziatzko. It may well have been that the girl was actually in the possession of the banker until Stratippocles paid the purchase price (cf. 629 ff.). On the soldier's self restraint, cf. Mis. 336 K.

²¹For significant mention of a name by a character innocent of the significance, cf. Hec. 280; Aul. 696 ff. Slightly different are Mi. 1132 ff.; Sam. 294 f.; cf. Eu. 553 ff. Davos in the Phormio has no trouble in divining the trend of Geta's account (110: cf. 101). Cf. Mer. 269 ff., considered below, sec. II, 4.

the fact that the recognition will be accomplished by means of a ring. This much Donatus recognizes:

574.1 IPSE ERIPVIT VI IN DIGITO hic ad exitum spectat παρασκευή
quia per anulum fiet cognitio.

Possibly the recognition is foreshadowed when Phidippus addresses Bacchis as she is entering the house to assure Philumena and Myrrina that Pamphilus is no longer her lover:

791 at eadem amicas fore tibi promitto rem ubi cognorint; (om. A)
nam illas errore et te simul suspicione exsolves.

It is possible that a double entendre is intended here by the author, since "error" is the usual technical term for mistaken identities.

In the Phormio, the situation is somewhat like that in the Andria, and as in the latter play, the girl here, Phanium, is referred to in the expository scene as an Attic citizen (114), bonam bonis prognatam (115; cf. 168 f.), although she is also described as indotatam ... atque ignobilem (120). Here again, when the girl is unexpectedly discovered at home, she is found in that careless disarray which most readily reveals beauty and which suggests that the girl has no thought for men or meretricious adornment, and so is eligible to become the wife of a gentleman:

... virgo pulchra, et quo mage diceres,
105 nil aderat adiumenti ad pulchritudinem:
capillu' passu' nudu' pes, ipsa horrida,
lacrumae, vestitu' turpis: ut, ni vis boni
in ipsa inesset forma, haec formam exstinguerent.

Donatus finds a hint of the coming recognition also in the consoling words (162 ff.) which Phaedria addresses to Antipho. The commentator remarks:

169.2 VT VOLVISTI VXOREM bona praeparatio uxoris futurae.

Phormio in his first sally against the old man, Demipho, intimates that the girl is a citizen (415), as of course he must, since the whole legal procedure is based upon the presumption that the girl

concerned is an Athenian citizen. The main concern of the audience is hardly any longer whether or not the girl is a citizen, but whose daughter she is, and this is practically revealed as soon as it is known that Chremes has a daughter who has recently come from Lemnos to Athens (567 ff.). It is remarkable that no mention of Lemnos was made in the exposition in connection with Phanium. Such mention would have made the identity certain at the words of Chremes, and it would have been a very simple matter to explain the girl's lack of acquaintances (cf. 97 ff.) by saying that she had only recently come to Athens from Lemnos, just as in the *Andria* the girl has recently come from Andros. Significant use of the name, Corinth, is made in the *Heauton*, just as of the *Tauropolia* in the *Periciromene* and of *Sunium* in the *Eunuchus*. By such use of a name the author can reveal to the audience facts which no single character on stage could reveal. This is a very subtle device, however, and perhaps Apollodorus was not accustomed to using it.

In the *Rudens*, there is absolutely no assurance given the audience concerning the chastity or the decent education of *Palaestra* either before or after the recognition. There is an abundance of other foreshadowing, however, besides the direct statements of the prologue (39 ff.). At the cost of some awkwardness, the poet has *Daemones* state early in the play that he once had a little daughter but lost her (106). Later, *Daemones* addresses *Palaestra* as "my daughter", of course with dramatic irony (742 ff.; cf. 604 f.),²² and adds that his daughter, if alive, would be of similar size.²³ The fact that *Palaestra* was born

²²Cf. Ge. 58 f., and the remarks of Fraenkel, above, note 16.

²³Cf. Eu. 318 and 526, discussed above.

free is repeatedly mentioned, first by Palaestra herself (217). Trachalio insists that both Palaestra and Ampelisca ought to be free (649#; 714; 736; 1104 ff., cf. Jachmann 53), and definitely states that Palaestra was born of free parents in Athens (738 ff.; cf. 1079; 1105 ff.). The casket and the trinkets are also mentioned early in the play (389 ff.; cf. 1078 ff.; 1130 ff.), and since it is there stated that the casket had been shut up in a trunk in which was also placed all the gold and silver of the slave dealer-- a statement later verified by Labrax himself (545 f.), the audience easily recognizes the trunk when Gripus appears with it and says:

926 ... quidquid inest, graue quidemst; aurum hic
ego inesse reor ...

The Poenulus is another play where the decent education and the chastity of the girls to be recognized are not stressed. It is repeatedly stated, however, that Agorastocles has not laid hands upon Adelphasium (prol. 95 ff.; 281; cf. 292; 343#; 1095 f.). Adelphasium sometimes speaks with a vulgar prudery (300 ff.; 320 ff.; 1185 ff.), which Agorastocles praises very highly:

1221 ut pudice uerba fecit, cogitate et commode,
ut modeste orationem praebuilt!

Some of her speeches are anything but what we should expect from a modest girl fit to become the wife of a citizen.²⁴ But the natural inference from the following lines of Adelphasium seems to be that she has never had any other admirer, and that she is therefore still virgin and fit to become the wife of a respectable citizen:

... non aequos in me es, sed morare et male facis.
360 bene promittis multa ex multis: omnia incassum cadunt.
liberare iurauisti me hau semel sed centiens:
dum te exspecto, neque ego usquam aliam mihi parauī copiam
neque istuc usquam apparet; ita nunc seruiō nihilo minus.

²⁴Cf. 339 f.; 346, cf. Leo, edition ad hoc; also, 235 f.; 272; 1288; 1299.

After the recognition has practically taken place, we are given further assurance on the point by the girls' nurse, Giddenis:

tua pietas nobis plane auxilio fuit,
quom huc aduenisti hodie in ipso tempore;
namque hodie earum mutarentur nomina
1140 facerentque indignum genere quaestum corpore.

At the end of the play, the girls themselves have an excellent opportunity to remark whether or not the slave dealer has treated them kindly and decently, but they fail to do so (1405 f.).²⁵ The actual recognition of both Agorastocles and the two girls is foreshadowed somewhat crudely by the conversation between Syncerastus and Milphio, inserted just before the appearance of

²⁵Cf. Cu. 697 f. On Po. 350, cf. Fraenkel, 272, note 1.

The Poenulus is usually considered one of the prime examples of contamination in Plautus (Leo, P.F., 170 ff.; Fraenkel, 262 ff.; Jachmann, 195 ff.). Fraenkel is comparatively conservative, holding that both the intrigues must belong to the same original, and that the one important insertion is the second scene of the first act (210-409). As I have intimated above in my text, the Poenulus does not contain the repeated assurances of the chastity of the girls to be recognized, or at least, these assurances are blurred in the Poenulus by disconcerting notes with regard to the girls' characters. Fraenkel's assumption, therefore, appears attractive from the point of view of the present study. Still there are serious objections to such an assumption. Fraenkel stresses the lack of connection between this scene and the remainder of the play, but I find a considerable number of very minor points of connection. Compare the following: 205, 257 ff.; and 416; 98 and 281, 292; 264 and 821; 359 ff. and 1137 ff.; 361, 372 (cf. Fraenkel, 275 f.), and 1205 ff. More weighty, perhaps, is the consistency with which the characterization of the two girls is carried out. In both this scene and the scene of recognition, Anterastilis is the naive, simple younger sister; Adelphasium, the self-consciously modest, somewhat prudish purveyor of popular morality. Compare 300 ff. and 1201 ff.; 283 ff., 297 ff., and 1181 ff., 1192a ff. Note 234. Furthermore, the remarks of Agorastocles on the "wisdom" of his sweetheart are somewhat similar in both scenes. Compare 310, 325, and 1197 a, 1221 f. Still, such remarks and also such character contrast are somewhat stereotyped in New Comedy. On the other hand, as pointed out in the text, there are lines in the first scene which present the girls as altogether too much inured to the life of a courtesan. They are noticeably more decent as presented in the second scene. The lines which immediately precede this scene (I ii), vss. 190 ff., are usually considered Plautine botchwork (Leo, P.F., 177 f.; Fraenkel, 270 f.). This may be correct, but the "abandoned exit motivation" of vs. 194 is not a valid argument, since numerous similar cases can be cited. Cf. my note on Peri. 160-184 in Cl. Phil. (July, 1933). On the uncertain character of the girls, cf. Rudens.

Hanno. Syncerastus simply tells his friend that the girls are freeborn Carthaginians, and Milphio reveals in turn the fact that his master is also a Carthaginian by birth (894 ff.). When Hanno appears immediately afterwards and says that he is searching for his two daughters and his brother's son, the recognition is practically accomplished as far as the audience is concerned (950 ff.).

In the *Captivi*, the education of Tyndarus as a respectable person is not mentioned until after the recognition (991 f.). This is not very remarkable. The character of a girl must be beyond reproach if she is to become the wife of a citizen, but the character of a boy is of less importance and is quite unessential to the plot of the play. There is other preparation, however, which also prepares for the appearance of the resolving character, Stalagmus (759 ff.; 875 f.; 881, cf. Fraenkel 246). Tyndarus himself looks forward to manumission from the hands of Philocrates (408; 440; 711 ff.). The identity of Tyndarus has been revealed in the prologue (7 ff.), and lines such as vs. 628 are dramatic irony.

a. False Preparation or Notable Lack of Preparation
for Recognition.

The most significant case of false preparation in Terence is found in the *Adelphoe* in a scene which, as Terence himself tells us, is inserted from another play (6 ff.), translated word for word (11). In this scene, wherein the girl is abducted (155 ff.), Aeschinus makes the claim that the girl is free (194). But the girl is not free (724 f.; 845 ff.). Recalling the usual preparation for cases of recognition in which the girl is discovered to be an Attic citizen, we can hardly doubt that in the play from which this scene was taken, the *Synapothmescontes* of Diphilus, the

girl actually did turn out to be a citizen.²⁶

It has frequently been assumed that in the original of the *Casina*, the recognition of the heroine, foretold in the prologue (81 f.) and in the epilogue (1012 ff.), took place in the body of the play, and that Plautus deliberately excluded this in his version. From the standpoint of the present study, however, there is not the slightest evidence of any preparation for recognition in the play as it now stands. The heroine's education as a daughter and her chaste character are mentioned in the prologue (45 f.; 81 ff.). In the body of the play there is no such mention, but this fact is of small importance because in the one other play known to be from Diphilus, the *Rudens*, no assurance as to

²⁶Some justification for the inclusion of the line can be found. Kauer (Dziatzko-Kauer, *Adelphoe*,² p. 11, note 2; cf. ad *Adel.* 194) says:

... auch bei Diphilus konnte dies ebenso nur eine Drohung sein, da selbst in dem Falle, dass diese *meretrix* bei ihn eine freigeborene, in ihrer Jugend etwa dem Elternhause entfremdete *Athenerin* war, die Erkennung nur am *Schluss* des Stueckes erfolgen konnte. ... Dass diese Drohung auch in unserem Stuecke gut zum Charakter des Aeschinus passt ...

This opinion is diametrically opposed to that of Dziatzko (*Adelphoe*,¹ p. 9; cf. *Rh. Mus.* xxxi, 374 ff.). I agree with Dziatzko that we here have a blunder of contamination. This claim of free birth invariably foreshadows recognition in all other cases where it occurs. Although we must never overlook the possibility of exceptions to any rule in Attic drama, still, the amount of evidence behind the present point makes it as certain a case as we could hope to find. In my opinion, vs. 194 could be definitely pronounced the product of contamination even if there were no external evidence. False preparation does occur elsewhere in Plautus and Terence. In fact, it occurs so frequently in intrigues that I am not inclined to place much importance upon it there. But with regard to recognition as a citizen, the case is different. This is the sole example, and that fact appears to me to warrant the conclusions of Dziatzko. (*Po.* 372, "*cluis Attica*," is admittedly inconsistent with the later development (cf. *Fraenkel*, 275 f.); but it is not false preparation.) Kauer overlooks the very existence of preparation and is clearly wrong when he intimates that "*libera nata*" would be of no consequence even in Diphilus' play, since the recognition could take place only at the end of the play. The present study illustrates amply how regularly the recognition is foreshadowed from the very beginning of the play.

the girl's character is given.²⁷

Some of the lines which describe the character of Philematium in the *Mostellaria* come dangerously close to the type of preparation so frequently found before recognition and marriage:

²⁷Jachmann (120) says:

So erschiene der Vorgang der Erkennung organisch mit den früheren verbunden, weiterer Vorbereitung war sie nicht beduerftig, ja kaum faehig.

This is an error similar to that of Kauer discussed in the preceding note. We should certainly expect preparation for the recognition in the earlier part of the play, although as pointed out in the text, Diphilus appears to dispense with assurances of good character found so frequently in other plays, at least in the *Rudens* as translated by Plautus. Jachmann conjectures that the recognition in the *Casina* took place in the original by means of the gold ring which is named by Lysidamus along with "sandals and lots of good things" as a reward for Pandalisca if she succeeds in pacifying Casina. Part of Jachmann's remarks on the subject are very interesting in connection with the subject of this study (120):

Nicht unbedingt muss ein Ring in einer attischen Komoedie einer Wiedererkennung dienen, aber ... in solchem Zusammenhang zwingt die Erwahnung eines Ringes geradezu zum Aufhorchen!¹ und zum Durchdenken der dramatischen Moeglichkeiten die sich daran schliessen.

The footnote whose index is included above refers to a remark of Fraenkel on *Tri.* 1014, condalium. Fraenkel remarks in part (158 note):

Sollte es sich hier auch nicht ueberall um eine Wiedererkennung handeln, so muss doch immer der Ring ein gewisses Interesse auf sich gezogen haben.

As an example of a ring without significance, *Mil.* 771 may be cited. On the other hand, the ring in the *Curculio* (346, etc.) appears to have no significance when it is first introduced, but in the end proves the means of bringing about the recognition. In the *Casina*, however, I prefer the mode of recognition conjectured by Leo (209 note), if one insists on assuming, as I do not, that the recognition actually took place in the body of the original play. With reference to preparation for the recognition, perhaps the most important line of the play is vs. 198, according to the interpretation of Fraenkel. In my opinion, however, this interpretation is quite erroneous. I quote the passage at length, for, taken out of its context, the sentence seems to have quite a different meaning--the meaning assigned to it by Fraenkel:

CL. quin mihi ancillulam ingratiis postulat,
quae mea est, quae meo educta sumptu siet,
195 illico suo se dare,
sed ipsus eam amat. MY. opsecro,

190(SCAPHA) matronae, non meretricium est unum inseruire amantem.

206 PHILOLACHES pro di immortales, mulierem lepidam et pudico ingenio!

227 PHILEMATIUM ut fama est homini, exin solet pecuniam inuenire.
ego si bonam famam mihi seruasso, sat ero diues.

These lines reveal the fact that Philematium is an unusually good courtesan, but she expresses sentiments of a more vulgar nature

dice, nam hic nunc licet dicere:
nos sumus. CL. ita est. MY. unde ea tibi est?
nam peculi probam nil habere addeceret
200 clam uirum ... (Lindsay's text)

Fraenkel (300) remarks in part:

Da faellt naemlich die Frage der Myrrhina unde ea (scil. Casina) tibi est? vollstaendig zu Boden. Ohne irgend eine Antwort abzuwarten, faengt Myrrhina an zu schulmeistern; ihre Insinuationen sind in dieser Lage ungerecht und taktlos. So kann Diphilos den Dialog nicht gefuehrt haben. ... Die Frage unde ea tibi est fuehrt auf die fruehesten Schicksale der Casina, ihre Aussetzung und Auffindung, erinnert also den Zuhoeer erneut an das was er aus dem Prolog¹ erfahren hat und deutet voraus auf die ἀναγνώρισις am Ende des Stuecks.

Jachmann agrees with Fraenkel that no answer to the question is given, but differs as to the explanation (109 note):

... Doch wie dem sei, angenommen auch Myrrhina habe schon bei Diphilos so gefragt und habe auch eine Antwort erhalten, so enthielt diese Antwort gewiss nichts Wichtiges und namentlich nichts das die Wiedererkennung der Casina vorbereitete: fuer eine solche Vorbereitung war hier kaum der Ort, ja sie waere sogar, da es sich doch zweifellos um eine ἀναγνώρισις διὰ σημείων handelt, gegen alle Analogie.

On the contrary, this (198) certainly would be a proper place for preparation for the recognition. It would be gegen alle Analogie if recognition took place without some preparation in the body of the play. But the question has not the meaning which Fraenkel and Jachmann (?) assume. The whole context hinges around the point that the girl belongs to Cleustrata, and that her husband is trying to manage her affairs. Myrrhina quite properly replies that a wife really has no property, etc. Her question, which is only a rhetorical question, she answers herself as nam shows, and all her remarks are precisely pertinent. The question, then, does not mean "Where did you get the girl?" but "How is it (i.e., from what financial source) that the girl belongs to you (rather than to your husband)?" The next line follows precisely the same line of thought: "Really, it's not proper for a good wife to have anything ..." After reaching these conclusions on the meaning of the passage, I note that Schoell in the editio maior indicates lacunae in this passage, which he supplied as follows:

Dicere? <at liberae> nos sumus. itast.
<Dic ergo, ancilla priua> unde ea tibist?

(e.g., 298), and in general, these lines fall far short of the repeated assurances found in most plays where the girl is to be recognized as a citizen. No hint is given that Philematium has never been intimate with any one besides Philolaches, or that she has been raised as a free-born citizen. Scapha's praise, vss. 186 ff., is spoken from the point of view of a procuress.

It has been suggested that the Samia ended with Chrysis'

These suggestions, of course, show that Schoell realized that the question, *unde ea tibist?* in this context must have the significance which I have given it. This misinterpretation only goes to show on what unsubstantial basis scholars are willing to found elaborate theories of contamination or botchwork. Cf. other misinterpretations of Jachmann, above sec. II, 1, n. 5.

Jachmann (105 ff.) has presented an excellent refutation of the views of Fraenkel (292 ff.) and Leo (P.F. 167 f., 207 f.; Gesch. 127 f.) with regard to the extent of original Plautine work in the *Casina*. Leo seems to have been prejudiced by the low wit of the final scenes (cf. Jensen, *Menandri Reliquiae*, praefatio LIX). The opinion of Jachmann (116-20) is that we have Diphilus' play in the main with the end shortened, the recognition omitted. All three scholars have rejected the suggestion of Skutsch (*Kl. Schrift.* 193) with regard to the interpretation of vs. 65 of the prologue. In my opinion, Skutsch is right: the verse does not justify the inference that things are different in the play of Diphilus. The evidence which Skutsch points out seems to me sufficient, but the usage in Donatus is very interesting in this connection. Here it is evident that frequently the commentator uses "Terentius" when he is thinking merely of the author, not the translator or adapter. Cf. An. 119.3; Ph. 238.2. Sometimes "Menander" is used (e.g., Eu. 1001.1) in similar comments, where there is evidently no intention whatever of differentiating between the practices of the Greek author and the Latin translator. This is not only evident from the comments themselves, but is flatly stated (An. 9.2):

Et proprie 'fecit': s c r i b i t enim Terentius, qui uerba adhibet tantum, f a c i t Menander, qui etiam argumentum componit. sed saepe ad laudem Terentii 'fecit' de eo quod est t r a n s t u l i t.

In the light of this evidence, Norwood's inference (*Plautus and Terence*, p. 117) that the use of "Terentius" in Donatus (Hec. 774) implies originality in the Roman poet, is seen to be entirely fanciful. With reference to Cas. 37, *qui in morbo cubat*, it may be pointed out that this is as clear a case of translation Latin as is found in Plautus; so we naturally assume that both idea and phraseology are taken from the Greek original. Cf. Skutsch, *Rh. Mus.*, LV (1900) 278 (*Kleine Schriften*, p. 189 f.). How, then, can scholars assume that this excuse for the slave's not appearing in the play is Plautine, and that the slave played a role in the original? Cf. Leo, P.F. 208; Fraenkel, 293.

being recognized as the sister of Moschio and with a double marriage: Moschio and Plango, Demea and Chrysis (cf. Jensen, praefatio, xlv). In the extant fragments there is nothing to foreshadow the recognition and marriage of Chrysis. In his wrath, Demea vilifies her character, but this appears to be only idle abuse (121 ff.; 175 ff.). In her favor is the fact that she was poverty stricken when she came to Demea (162 ff.), and she is not ashamed of this fact. It also appears that she is a free woman (232#).

3. Intrigue

In the *Andria*, Davos' prediction to Simo that a baby be placed before their door as part of the ruse of Glycerium's bearing a child (507), may perhaps pave the way for this action in Davos' plot (722 ff.; cf. 840). Donatus remarks:

840 DAVVS DVDVM PRAEDIXIT MIHI hic ostenditur, quod uidit callidus Daus, ut praediceret futurum seni, quod ipse erat facturus.

The *Bacchides* is unusually rich in intrigues. There are no less than three designed to secure money (cf. 953 ff.), but through no fault of Chrysalus, the first intrigue does not result in Nicobulus' actual loss; thus there are two successful extortions (1127 f.). The necessity of securing money is mentioned early in the play (46; 104), and the situation is explained to Chrysalus upon his arrival (221 ff.). The actual plan is foreshadowed by the words of Chrysalus (224 ff; 239 ff., cf. Fraenkel, 27). So much for the first intrigue. The words of Mnesilochus may perhaps be considered foreshadowing of the second and third intrigues; they are especially interesting because of the last line here quoted:

...
nam mihi diuini numquam quisquam creduat,
505 ni ego illam exemplis plurumis planeque -- amo.
ego faxo hau dicet nactam quem derideat.

nam iam domum ibo atque -- aliquid surrupiam patri.
507^a id isti dabo. ego istanc multis ulciscar modis.
adeo ego illam cogam usque ut mendicet -- meu! pater.
sed satine ego animum mente sincera gero,
510 qui ad hunc modum haec hic quae futura fabulor?

Later, the need of money with which to buy off the soldier is stressed (606 ff.). Chrysalus promises to secure all the money needed (701 ff., cf. Fraenkel 63 f.), not only for the payment of the soldier but also for the "bacchanalia," thus looking forward to both the second and third intrigues. The binding of Chrysalus is of course foretold when he dictates Mnesilochus' letter to his father (747; cf. 795 ff.). Here again Chrysalus refuses to reveal his reasons for this peculiar step (749 ff.; cf. 720 ff.). In point of fact, the warning in Mnesilochus' letter and the directions for the binding of Chrysalus serve merely to give the impression that nothing is being done de compecto, and to make Nicobulus think that he is being very much on his guard against the intrigues of Chrysalus. As a part of the second intrigue, Nicobulus is induced to peep through the door of the sisters' house and to observe his son banqueting with a woman whom Nicobulus does not know (834). At the beginning of the play, Pistoclerus expresses apprehension lest a lunch or a drinking party or a banquet should be arranged of a sudden and lest he should be called upon to recline on the couch with one of the girls (79 ff.). Almost immediately Bacchis with her usual boldness announces that she wants to give a banquet -- in honor of her sister's arrival. But in order that Nicobulus may have precisely the proper view, there is very definite prearrangement of circumstance with no hint of its purpose (716 ff.). Chrysalus inquires about the precise location of the biclinium (720), pretending that he does not know what device he may hit upon. Later, he directs Mnesilochus and Pistoclerus each to recline on the

couch with his girl in the same spot where the couches are now prepared, and to begin drinking. He also directs that when they have reclined, they must not leave their places until he gives the signal (754 ff.). All of these directions are necessary for furnishing Nicobulus the proper view, and this view is very important for the happy solution of the plot. Nicobulus has already said that if Chrysalus told him the sun was the sun, he would believe that it was the moon, and that day was night (699 f.); so he must see for himself. Likewise, the soldier, Cleomachus, whose timely appearance is necessary for the success of the intrigue, is repeatedly mentioned in the earlier part of the play (? 9 ff.; 14 f.; 43 ff.; 90; 222 ff.), and the contract made with Bacchis is partly explained in the now fragmentary opening lines (14 ff.). The parasite, rudely dismissed by Pistoclerus, declares that his master will be angry and will himself soon appear (603), and Pistoclerus passes this news on to Mnesilochus (631 ff.). The actual payment of the money due the soldier is a matter of some doubt even after Nicobulus has given his formal pledge (883). Nicobulus says:

920 nunc quasi ducentis Philippis emi filium,
 quos dare promisi militi: quos non dabo
 temere etiam priu' quam filium conuenero.
 numquam edepol quicquam temere credam Chrysalo;
 uerum lubet etiam mi has pellegere denuo:
 aequomst tabellis consignatis credere.

These words are altogether in character; in fact, the action at this point would hardly seem plausible without them. But they automatically make the second letter, the missive of the third intrigue, absolutely essential for the successful execution of the second intrigue: Nicobulus does not see his son before paying the money, but he reads from a sealed letter of his son (the second letter):

1007 'pudet prodire me ad te in conspectum, pater:
tantum flagitium te scire audiui meum,
quod cum peregrini cubui uxore militis.'

Vs. 924, therefore, is not a stereotyped commonplace added to no purpose, but is included by the poet in anticipation of the second letter.¹ Chrysalus has already predicted that Nicobulus would pay the money to the soldier (969 f.). Later Nicobulus announces that he will fetch the money that he has promised the soldier and

¹Fraenkel (61 f. note; cf. De media et nova com. quaest. sel., 100 ff.) seems entirely to overlook the relation between these two passages (i.e., 919 ff. and 1007 ff.), and the amazingly nice precision with which the second intrigue is thus integrated with the third. He is led, therefore, to assume that perhaps Menander had Nicobulus enter not his own house at the end of the scene, but the house where his son was banqueting, as he intended vs. 921 to consult his son. Such an assumption is altogether unwarranted: Nicobulus' intention expressed in vs. 921 is satisfactorily fulfilled by vss. 1007 ff. Fraenkel strenuously objects to the "Abbiegen," vs. 923. He cites Po. 203 as a parallel, which is the result of contamination in his opinion and in the opinion of Leo (P.F. 177). We may compare also Mi. 585, suspected by Leo (P.F. 184). As pointed out in the text, the second letter fulfills all that is required by vss. 919 ff.; therefore, there is no real "Abbiegen," and even if there were, surely changes of purpose occur both in life and in the mirror of life. Compare Epit. 159 ff., noting especially the adversative of 163. Accordingly, Fraenkel has no justification whatever for terming vss. 923 f. "... die nicht eben gelungenen beiden Verse ...". As a further objection to a Menandrian origin of the third intrigue, Fraenkel (De media et nova com. quaest. sel., 101), points out that both the second and third intrigues are accomplished in the same manner, i.e., letters written by Chrysalus and carried by him to Nicobulus. Upon somewhat similar grounds, Jachmann (231) bases his argument against a proposed reconstruction of the original of the *Trinummus*:

Aber dass inzwischen noch eine Besprechung ueber den Acker zwischen Stasimus und Philto, fuer den die Sache ja erledigt war, stattgefunden haette, ist kaum vorstellbar, geschweige denn einleuchtend, wobei ich davon gar nichts sagen will wie ungeschickt und unschoen es gewesen waere drei Verhandlungen ueber den gleichen Gegenstand aneinander zu reihen, wovon die zweite noch obendrein gaenzlich ueberfluessig war.

I shall later raise an objection against the proposed reconstruction of the original of the Miles based upon similar grounds except that in the Miles, the proposed "duplication" would perhaps cover a great deal more space, since the deception of Sceledrus takes more than three hundred lines (see note 10, below), and so be more objectionable. Leo (P.F. 179) anticipated this objection, however:

that his son has requested (1049 ff.), and he does actually pay the soldier in spite of the fact that the soldier tells him that the woman was not his wife but a courtesan (cf. 1096).

Before Habrotonon in the Epitreponetes puts into effect her scheme to discover whether or not Charisius is really the father of the baby, and incidentally, to secure her own freedom, she explains her plan carefully to Onesimus (294 ff.). Phronesium in the Truculentus plans a somewhat similar deception, but with quite different intent.

In the Eunuchus, vss. 230 f. may possibly be considered

... dies durchzufuehren ohne durch Wiederholung der gleichen Situation laestig zu werden, wird der attische Dichter schon Wege gefunden haben.

With regard to the Miles, the assumption of Leo might, I think, be questioned because of the nature and length of the events to be "duplicated" and because of the limitations of the stage in presenting such events. But in the Bacchides, it seems to me, we have an excellent example of the ability of the artistic poet to vary two similar devices: the first letter is dictated on the stage (731 ff.) but not read aloud (cf. 789 ff.); the second letter is read aloud by Nicobulus (997 ff.), but was not dictated on the stage. Further, the immediate objectives of the two letters are entirely different, as of course are their contents, also. The first letter is designed to produce a certain psychological effect upon Nicobulus; the second, to produce much more positive and concrete results. Granting for the moment that an Attic dramatist was determined to use two letters in these scenes, can we imagine a more skillful variation than that found in the Bacchides? Even Fraenkel admits (*op. cit.*, p. 102 f.) that the actual letter of the third intrigue must have been taken from some Attic source, although, he maintains, the canticum of Chrysalus is mostly if not wholly Plautine (cf. Norwood, below, sec. III, 2a, n. 4.). Both Prehn (*Quaest. Plaut.*, Breslau, 1916, p. 66 ff.) and Kunst (*Studien*, 109 ff.) convincingly maintain that the second letter is absolutely essential. The reconciliation of the title of the Greek original, the three fates of Troy (953 ff.), ludos bis factum (1090), and bis detonsa (1128) is a difficult problem. This much is evident, however: the poet had no choice with regard to the number of the fates of Troy; if Plautus invented the whole of the third intrigue, the Troy monody, and the "sheep" scene he was eminently successful. In fact, it seems to me an evitable conclusion that if Plautus really invented these scenes or added them from other sources, his play must be superior to the original of Menander. This is the logical conclusion to be drawn from Fraenkel's premises, in my opinion. Not only does the conclusion make his reasoning suspicious, but his premises with regard to each of the three scenes are unacceptable. On the "sheep" scene, and the possibility of its being in the original, cf. Prescott, TAPA, 1932.

preparation for the main intrigue of the play -- the substitution of Chaerea for the eunuch:

230 ... mirum ni ego me turpiter hodie hic dabo
cum meo decrepito hoc eunucho.

The commentator remarks:

231.2 Et iam praeparatio est ad deducendum Chaeream quam deformem eunuchum.

If in the original this play had an expository prologue which set forth the intrigue, these lines were then dramatic irony (cf. 300 f.), but in the play as it stands, they certainly contain no foreshadowing, and if preparation at all, they are preparation of the vaguest type. The trick which Pythias plays upon Parmeno is well foreshadowed. Upon discovering the havoc that has been wrought, Pythias remarks:

719 inveniam pol hodie parem ubi referam gratiam.

And later, she says:

910 quid, quid venire in mentem nunc possit mihi,
quidnam qui referam sacrilego illi gratiam
qui hunc suppos (1) vit nobis?

941 ego pol te pro istis dictis et factis, scelus,
ulciscar, ut ne inpune in nos inluseris.

Interesting comments stressing the dramatic purpose of the trick are found in Donatus:

719 INVENIAM HODIE POL PAREM hic iam προεικονομία ad futurum exitum fabulae (est); nam dum se ulciscitur Pythias, fit indicium patri Chaereae et confirmantur nuptiae.

941 EGO POL TE PRO ISTIS DICTIS ET FACTIS SCELVS VLCISCAR miro artificio poetae et ab initio non placatur Pythias nec redit in gratiam Chaereae et insuper nunc a Parmenone ir ritatur magis, ut per eam Parmeno terreatur, per Parmenonem ingredi ad Thaidem cogatur senex, per senem nuptiae confirmantur. haec ergo artificibus et eruditis, cetera spectatoribus poeta exhibet.

The trick of Pythias, therefore, is well prepared for, and deceives no one but Parmeno and his master.

In the Heauton, the intrigue is not very elaborately prepared for. It may be significant, however, that Chremes, the one

who actually becomes the victim, broaches the subject, advising his friend Menedemus to allow himself to be tricked rather than voluntarily to give money to his son (469 ff.). We have already been warned that money is needed for Bacchis (329). The encouragement to mulct Menedemus which Chremes gives Syrus is also suspicious (533 ff.). The two principals, Syrus and Chremes, discuss tricks for securing money at considerable length (512 ff.), and after Chremes has openly said that Clinia's slave should trick Menedemus out of the money needed to support his sweetheart, Syrus puts in a timely reminder:

550 ... at heus tu facito dum eadem haec memineris
siquid huius simile forte aliquando evenerit,
ut sunt humana, tuos ut faciat filius.

The clever subtlety of this preparation and the irony of Chremes' remarks are not to be overlooked. The fact that several passages are concerned precludes the possibility of a happy accident such as Demaenetus' command in the *Asinaria* (91) me defrudato may possibly be. Menander is exercising conscious art here, and it is not improbable that a considerable part of the audience grasped the significance of this preparation. It is of the same general type as that in which the victim expresses his determination to be on his guard.² Later in the *Heauton*, the recognition of Antiphila disrupts the plans of Syrus, but he hastily forms others (668 ff.), and although he pretends entirely to abandon those plans³ which he formed before the recognition, he actually makes material use of his first inventions (cf. 600 ff.; 790 ff.). Further explanation is given when Syrus informs Clinia of his plan (703) and deceitfully informs Chremes (771 ff.).

The intrigue in the *Phormio* is elaborately prepared. The

²Ba. 699 f.; Mo. 927; Ph. 713 ff.; Ps. 474; 641 ff.; 894 ff.

³Cf. below, note 4.

situation of Phaedria is described in the exposition (80 ff.), significant hints of the coming complications are noticeable.

The commentator sums them up thus:

83.2 EA SERVIEBAT LENONI <I.> magna praeparatio ad rerum difficultatem imminantium: puella citharistria, suarus leno, amator perditus, inopia.

94 PAVPERTAS MIHI ONVS VISVM EST statim fit mentio paupertatis, ut sit causa fallaciae Phormionis.

The lack of money is again stressed vss. 144 ff. Phaedria himself refers to his miserable situation in trying to console Antipho (166 ff.). The difficulties are later presented dramatically in a scene with the slave dealer (485 ff.). One of the minor purposes of having Antipho run away, leaving his defence to Phaedria and Geta, is to put Antipho under immediate obligation to Phaedria, so that Antipho will feel obliged to come to the aid of his cousin (cf. 536 ff.). Demipho understands the real cause of Phaedria's pleading Antipho's case (cf. 475; 835 ff.):

266 DE. hic in noxast, ille ad defendundam causam adest;
quom illest, hic praestost: tradunt operas mutuas.
GE. probe horum facta imprudens depinxit senex.
DE. nam ni haec ita essent, cum illo haud stares, Phaedria.

Referring to the last line, above, the commentator says:

269.1 ... uide quemadmodum iam praestruat poeta ad ea quae futura sunt ad adiuuandum amorem Phaedriae.

Further on in the same scene, Demipho complains to Geta that no matter if the girl was proved to be a kinswoman, there was no necessity of Antipho's marrying her: the law provides the option of giving the girl a dowry, and this should have been done instead.

To this Donatus' remark is:

295.1 TV SERVVS VERVM SI COGNATA EST MAXIME sub obtentu huius propositionis, in qua pars legis ostenditur, iam poeta praeparat locum fallaciae Phormionis de dote accipienda.

And again, when the old gentleman indignantly gives Geta to understand that he will not allow his son to live with the girl a single day, Donatus finds still further evidence:

304.2 EGONE ILLAM CVM ILLO VT PATIAR NVPTAM hic iam praestruitur
quam facile triginta minas perditurus sit Demipho, dum illam
uult excludere.

In the following scene, Phormio is considering the possible
courses which the old man may take, and evidently his own line of
action in the event of each:

319 ... si rogabit eccere
quid si reddet? ... sic opinor.

The commentator remarks:

319.2 QUID SI REDDET bene iam ad illud respicit fabula, quod
futurum est, propter Phaedriam.

Thus, when the intrigue is actually invented and put into effect,
it is an entirely plausible one. Geta appears to form his plan
vss. 555 ff. (cf. 591 ff.) but he does not give any explanation
until vss. 699 ff., when he naturally explains the eventual happy
solution of the plan to Antipho: during the time that they are
pretending to prepare for Phormio's wedding, money can be borrowed
from friends which can be used to repay the dowry money and the
marriage can be called off for some reason or other. Likewise,
Phormio has invented the story of a little business trip (837 ff.),
which he thinks necessary for the smooth operation of the plot.
The successful deception of Demipho may be foreseen in his lines
(713 ff.) where he expresses confidence in his ability to deal
cautiously with Phormio. But neither of these well devised plans
is actually needed, since it is subsequently discovered that the
old men no longer wish to be rid of the girl, and a simpler solu-
tion of the whole intrigue is immediately hit upon (884 ff.).⁴

⁴Note the "overelaboration" of the intrigue. Here the
abandoning of the plan, however, is more natural than in some
other cases. (E.g., the Miles, if 806 ff. is really mere over-
elaboration. Cf. below.) The opposite type of technique -- a
distinctly theatrical type -- is seen in the Pseudolus, where
Pseudolus is supremely confident that he will succeed in his in-
trigue (508 ff.) although he has no plan (567), and we can be
fairly sure that unless the gods came to his aid rather patently,
as they do, he would not succeed, despite his bragging. Cf. Ba.

In the *Mercator*, Demipho announces his plan to have Lysimachus purchase the girl for him (466 ff.).

The slight and eventually unnecessary deception in the *Trinummus* by which Callicles and Megaronides plan to give the appearance of receiving the dowry money from Charmides, is carefully explained in detail before being put into execution (765 ff.), thus foreshadowing the arrival of the sycophant and making possible the amusing scene between him and Charmides.

In the *Asinaria*, the imminence of an intrigue to secure money becomes evident in the first scene:

55 :: ... sed eum morbus inuasit grauis.
:: quid morbi est? :: quia non suppetunt dictis data.

Demaenetus repeatedly expresses his desire to aid his son (74 ff.), and Libanus undertakes to secure the money, but there is no real prospect of his doing so until the arrival of the merchant is announced (333 ff.). This arrival comes as a surprise, having received no preparation. The success of the intrigue is announced vss. 554 ff.⁵

There is little opportunity for preparation for the intrigue in the *Curculio*. The parasite tells the story of his experience with the soldier (337 ff.) upon which it immediately becomes obvious just what the intrigue will consist of. The plan is launched almost immediately (365 ff.).

Early in the *Epidicus*, the urgent need of money foreshadows

722; *Hea.* 327, 335 f., 600 ff.; *An.* 733 (cf. Legrand, 396).

⁵The precise amount of money needed is inconsistently handled by the author. Demaenetus states that his son needs twenty minae (89). But in the scene between Cleareta and Argyripus, no specific sum appears to have been agreed upon. Two silver talents are mentioned (193), but at the end a definite bargain is made and the consideration set at twenty minae (230). Of course the merchant turns up with precisely this amount (348). Cf. Langen, *Plaut. Studien*, Berlin, 1886, pp. 97 f.

the intrigue (52 ff.; 114 ff.; 141 ff.) and it soon becomes clear that Epidicus is the man to turn the trick (120; 158 ff., cf. Fraenkel, 234). When he has formed his plan, he explains it carefully to the audience (312 ff.) and to Stratippocles and Chaeribulus (363 ff.). The determination of the old men to be on their guard against fraud foreshadows their being taken in (292, cf. 359; 427 ff.).

In the Miles, the intrigues are well explained before they take place. Plans for the error of identity are laid at the beginning of the play (185 ff.; 227), and although during the prologue Palaestrio has lapsed into the omniscient point of view and has revealed that his fellow slave is to be deceived,⁶ here in the play at first it appears that the soldier himself is to be the object of the deception (235 ff., cf. Jachmann 166 f.; cf. 246 ff.). Even after Palaestrio and his allies have moved up their siege machinery against Sceledrus (cf. 266), the idea that the soldier must also be deceived apparently is still prevalent, although vss. 395 f. might be considered as spoken solely for the benefit of Sceledrus. The crucial passage vss. 806 ff., in my opinion, is simply another appearance of this well established idea that the soldier, too, must be deceived. This, in my opinion, is the plan that is mentioned in vss. 590 ff. and 596 ff. The second intrigue -- the plan of escape, which includes the entrapment of the soldier -- is not mentioned or even conceived until vss. 765 ff.⁷ There is no hint of any such intention in the early

⁶M1. 147 ff., cf. Jachmann 167 ff. As possible parallels to this lapse, I suggest Cas. 1012 ff., Cis. 147 f.

⁷Note dudum, vs. 808, and cf. 596 ff. The assumption that vss. 590 ff., and 596 ff. refer to the deception of identity proposed against the soldier, not to the second intrigue, explains a problem which has long puzzled students of contamination in the Miles (Leo, P.F. 181; Fraenkel, 253 f.; 267). The plan referred to at the beginning of Act III is the plan of deceiving the soldier just as Sceledrus has been deceived. The plan which Palaestrio

part of the play, although it might be considered implicit in the presence of Pleusicles.⁸ It is only after Palaestrio has been informed that Sceledrus is incapacitated,⁹ and the second intrigue is definitely under way that the idea of deceiving the soldier on the point of identity is dropped. Even then, the existence of the twin sister is consistently retained.¹⁰ The second intrigue consists of two phases which, in the play as it stands, are intimately connected: the soldier is to be led to believe that a

brings forth vss. 765 ff. is really a new plan which the other have not heard of before. It is not the same plan that has been discussed in the house, and therefore, its presentation as an entirely new plan is self-explanatory.

⁸The entrapment of the soldier, however, is clearly in the mind of the poet when he stresses the character of the soldier as a "woman-killer" and "home-breaker" (58 ff.; prol. 91; cf. 775 ff., 801 f.).

⁹Sceledrus has already been quite convinced of the real existence of the twin (543 ff.). But this fact does not, apparently, justify the abandonment of the deception. The Lurcio scene seems to have been inserted to assure Palaestrio and the audience that all is well within (cf. 867 ff.). The passage in which Sceledrus contemplates flight and changes his mind (582 ff.) cannot fairly be used as an argument for contamination as Leo uses it (P.F. 183 f.). In a comedy, we expect those who contemplate suicide or flight to change their minds (although Lurcio does resort to flight, vss. 861 ff.). Cf. below, section III. 3a. In general, there is nothing surprising or un-Attic in a change of mind. Cf. Epit. 159 ff.

¹⁰It is hard to imagine any way of perpetrating an identity deception on the stage other than the way used to effect it with regard to Sceledrus. A priori, it would seem unlikely that, if this is the case, the dramatist would repeat two long similar scenes, one with Sceledrus and one with the soldier. Cf. note 1 above, regarding the second letter in the Bacchides. The existence of a twin sister is essential to the identity deception, while the presence of the mother is desirable for the dismissal of Philocomasium. The soldier had deceived the mother and abducted her daughter secretly (106 ff.). Apparently, therefore, he had reason to fear the mother, although no fear is observable in his remarks on her presence. Jachmann (189) is not justified, therefore, in remarking ad vss. 975 f.:

Dass der magnus moechus mehr Interesse fuer die alte Mutter als fuer die junge Tochter haben sollte, ist nicht eben wahrscheinlich.

A similar explanation may be offered for vs. 1107 (cf. Jachmann, 188). Such explanations are not very satisfactory, but they are of precisely the same calibre as the objections which they are

beautiful young matron is in love with him; he must, therefore, make every effort to have Philocomasium leave his house at once; after this has been arranged and after the soldier's whole attention has been fixed on the bait of the trap, he is inveigled into the house of the matron, caught as an adulterer, and humiliated to such an extent that pursuit of the lovers is out of the question (cf. 1435). This is an extremely intricate conspiracy in the world of New Comedy, although each step is simple enough. It is noteworthy that the plan is not explained once for all, but seems to develop as it progresses. This presentation is at once

designed to answer. In the latter part of the play, the mother and sister are mentioned together frequently (975 ff.; 1102 ff.; 1146; 1313; 1315; on all, cf. Jachmann 186 ff.). The mother alone is occasionally mentioned (1184 ff.; 1299). The hole-in-the wall theme is not, then, entirely dropped as Leo (P.F. 179) claims, since the sister is an intimate part of this theme (cf. also 1089 ff.). In general, the Miles is one of the most important plays in any consideration of contamination (Jachmann, 162 ff.; Fraenkel, 253 ff.; Leo, P.F. 178 ff.). The problem is so large and complex and varies so much with the different scholars who have treated it that not even an outline is practical here. Most of the passages treated in the text are involved, especially as viewed by Jachmann. Jachmann's treatment is especially vicious in its persistence in isolating a particular inconsistency and considering it from a cold logical standpoint with apparently no thought of actual dramatic practice. For instance, he seizes upon the phrase in the prologue, *qui hinc ad forum abiit* (89), as something that only a divine prologue speaker could know. But he fails to point out in this connection, that Palaestrio addresses Acroteleutium by name, vs. 900, although he apparently had no reason to know her name at this point. (Cf. 789; Fraenkel 256. Cf. Ru. 1177). Further, Periplectomenus apparently had no means of knowing of Pyrgopolynices' boast of being the grandson of Venus (cf. 1265, ? spoken to Palaestrio alone), though he very effectively uses this boast to taunt the soldier (1413). A simpler and clearer inconsistency, and one which certainly cannot be laid to the botchwork of contamination is the status of Dicea, who now has a master (451), and now is "ingenua et libera" (490). The unusual complexity of the Miles and the presence of minor inconsistencies in other comedies and even in Attic tragedy are two facts which must not be overlooked (cf. Wilamowitz' introduction to Euripides Ion, p. 16).

Fraenkel (255) assumes that vs. 738 and 749, where Periplectomenus expresses the intention of departing to purchase provisions lead us to expect a dinner to take place in his house later in the play. To me, these lines appear only an excuse for parading more of Periplectomenus' amusing philosophy, and they can hardly be considered false preparation. Even if they are so considered, they are readily paralleled and are of no consequence as an argument for contamination. Cf. below, sections III. 2 and III 2a.

more natural and more easily grasped by the audience. The original plan of entrapment is proposed as a means of escape for the lovers (765 ff.; 813 ff.; 936 ff.), and of tricking the soldier (765 ff.; 904 ff.). After the offensive is definitely begun against Pyrgopolynices, the departure of Philocomasium is arranged (973 ff.; 1094 ff., cf. 1146), and a new element in the plot, the addition of gifts to hasten her departure is introduced (980 ff.; 1126 ff., cf. 1147 f., 1204 f., 1302 ff.). Still later, another element is introduced: the escape of Palaestrio. This is at first planned as mere flight (1192 f.), but without warning, it is changed by Philocomasium's demanding and receiving Palaestrio as a gift (1205).¹¹ As the intrigue progresses, its development is foreshadowed in practically every detail by various explanations: vss. 930 ff., 1025 ff. (cf. Fraenkel, 66), 1158 ff. The appearance of Pleusicles as ship-master is of course foretold (1175 ff., cf. 1109 and Jachmann, 190 f.).

The development of the intrigue in the *Mostellaria* is foreshadowed by hints thrown out by Tranio. To Philolaches he intimates that he will not only keep Theopropides from entering the house, but will even make him flee from it (390; cf. 422 ff.). If the audience knew the title of the play, it would immediately grasp the significance of this. Tranio further gives directions to his master about closing the house, not answering the door, and making no noise (398 ff.). Late in the play when he is sent to the country by Theopropides, Tranio informs the audience of his intention of stealing in the back way and telling the merry-makers of his success (931 f.). When he reenters the stage,

¹¹By this device, the soldier appears more than ever deceived and defrauded. The first plan may have been formed merely in order that Pleusicles might assure Palaestrio that he would receive his freedom when they reached Athens (1193 f.), as the freeing of the faithful slave often forms a part of the happy ending.

he makes a report of his activity, and assures the audience of his determination to carry on (1041 ff.). Somewhat later than usual in the intrigue, the victim reminds his deceiver and himself that he must be very cautious: Theopropides intimates that it takes all his wits to be on his guard against Trainio, and Trainio agrees with him (927).

In the Persa, the intrigue is foreshadowed from the beginning of the play. In his entrance monologue, Toxilus relates his futile search for money (5 f.). Later he tells Sagaristio that this is the day that decides whether his love shall be free or for ever a slave, and begs for financial assistance (34 ff.). At the end of their conversation, he assures his friend that he will cook up trouble of some sort for the slave dealer (52). Before his conversation with Saturio, he informs the audience that he has worked out a plan whereby the slave dealer will free the girl out of his own pocket (81 f., cf. 325 ff.). It soon becomes clear that the fraud is to take a well known form: the daughter of Saturio is ostensibly to be sold into slavery with her connivance and later claimed by her father¹² (134 ff.; 162 ff.; cf. 357 f.). The forged letter is mentioned (460 f.) before it appears in the action. After the deception has practically succeeded, there occur some interesting lines of directions:

676 TOXILUS audin tu, Persa? ubi argentum ab hoc acceperis,
simulato quasi eas prosum in nauem. SAGARISTIO ne doce.
TO. per angiportum rusum te ad me recipito
illac per hortum. SAG. quod futurum est praedicas.

The first intrigue in the Poenulus receives the usual detailed explanations. Milphio outlines his plan to his master (165 ff.). The off-stage preparations made for its execution are explained before and after they are accomplished (193 ff.;

¹²Cf. R. H. Barrow, Slavery in the Roman Empire, pp. 11 f., notes.

415 ff.; 424 ff.). The advocati whom Agorastocles procures indulge in an amusing violation of the dramatic illusion:

550 omnia istaec scimus iam nos, si hi spectatores sciant;
horunc hic nunc caussa haec agitur spectatorum fabula:
hos te satius est docere, ut, quando agas, quid agas sciant.

The audience has already been told the whole plan of intrigue, but Agorastocles proceeds to force his advocati to repeat it (555 ff.). After the intrigue is well launched, Agorastocles and his witnesses review point by point the action that he is to take. The successful duping of Lycus is perhaps foreshadowed by his report of the inauspicious sacrifices (449 ff.; cf. 847 f.), and especially by his arrogant heresy when he thinks that he has made a profitable deal with the stranger (746 ff.). His pride is soon brought low (787 ff.), but his faith is only partially healed (791 ff.). The second intrigue is hardly intended as more than a dramatic device designed to foreshadow and facilitate the recognitions.¹³ Early in the play the following conversation takes place between Milphio and his master:

188 AG. placet consilium. MI. immo etiam, ubi expoliuero,
magis hoc tum demum dices: nunc etiam rudest.

Since the plan which Milphio has just outlined is not changed in any of its details,¹⁴ it may be that these lines look forward to the second intrigue. This view is somewhat strengthened by the fact that after the first intrigue has apparently succeeded -- it is not really accomplished as long as the girls remain in the possession of the slave dealer, Milphio comes upon the stage with lines which intimate that he has not finished with the slave dealer by any means (817 ff.). Still other lines occur which strengthen the impression that Milphio did not consider his task finished

¹³This, at least, is my opinion. But cf. Fraenkel, 265.

¹⁴But cf. 732 ff., Jachmann, 203 ff.

with the apparent success of the first intrigue¹⁵ (cf. 907 ff.):

919 satine priu' quam unumst iniectum telum, iam instat alterum?
(iam: tam ut vid. P alterum: iterum P)

925 [ita negotium institutumst, non datur cessatio ...]

Milphio passes on to his master the information which he has received from Syncerastus, and explains the second intrigue while Hanno eavesdrops with great interest (963 ff.). Still later, he seizes upon Hanno as an excellent person to accomplish this intrigue and explains the plan to him (1086 ff.).

The intrigue in the Pseudolus receives elaborate preparation. From the beginning of the play, the lack of money and the sore need of it are stressed (46 ff.; 80 ff.; I iii passim). Pseudolus formally undertakes to supply this need (103 ff.). Just who is to be the victim of the fraud is somewhat uncertain. At first it would appear that, as usual, the father of Calidorus is to be chosen (120 ff.; 288 ff.) and Pseudolus at first declares that he will dig the money out of the old man in spite of the fact that Simo has got wind of the true situation (406 ff.), but he later changes his mind on this point (422 ff.; cf. Fraenkel, 214

¹⁵ These lines are highly disputed (cf. Jachmann, 196 f.; Fraenkel, 269 f.; Leo, P.F. 172 f.). There is no difficulty, in my opinion in interpreting vs. 919. Just as Nicobulus in the Bacchides is a sheep bis detonsa (1128) because he has actually lost money only twice though he has three times been the object of Chrysalus' attack, so here the weapon is not yet driven home simply because Lycus still holds the two girls, and a law suit must be won by Agorastocles before he can possess them. A fraud is not a fraud until it has become an accomplished fact.

Surely Jackmann (197) is unjustified in finding fault also with the following lines:

821 ... e fano recipere uideo se Syncerastum,
lenonis seruom ...

Near the beginning of the play (264), Milphio has overheard Anterastilis remark that their master was awaiting them at the temple of Venus. With this in mind, Milphio could easily infer from the vessels in Syncerastus' hands (cf. 847) that his friend was returning from the sacrifice. That such an inference would be altogether natural is proved by Rudens 428.

f.). Simo's determination to be on his guard against Pseudolus adds considerably to the likelihood that he will be a victim (474; 478; 504 ff., 516 f.). Ballio is also named as an objective of Pseudolus' attack (232 ff.; 381 f.; 526 ff.). The two objectives are drawn together when Pseudolus induces Simo to agree to give him the money necessary if he succeeds in defrauding Ballio (535 ff.). Pseudolus indulges in numerous conceited speeches in which he reassures the audience (394 ff.; 562 ff.; 574 ff.; 667 ff.), and lets them into his secret when Harpax appears (600 ff.; 614, 636 f., cf. Fraenkel, 39; cf. 691). Harpax is also on his guard (641 ff.; 1120), as of course, Ballio is, too (894 ff.), who even warns his household against anyone's trusting Pseudolus (cf. 903 f.). Pseudolus himself explains the intrigue in a few brief lines (cf. 764 ff.):

... ubi hominem exornauero,
subditiuom fieri ego illum militis seruom uolo;
sumbolum hunc ferat lenoni cum quinque argenti minis,
mulierem ab lenone abducatur: em tibi omnem fabulam!
755 ceterum quo quidque pacto faciat ipsi dixero.

As a final ramification, Ballio agrees to pay Simo twenty minae if Pseudolus succeeds in carrying off the girl (1070 ff.; cf. 1223 ff.), thus, apparently, making himself the only one of the three to suffer an actual financial loss.

In the Vidularia, someone predicts the success of a money intrigue (xvi).

a. False Preparation or Notable Lack of
Preparation for Intrigue¹⁶

In the Bacchides, Chrysalus warns Nicobulus to be sure to take his son's ring when he sails off to secure the remainder of

¹⁶ Cf. above, sec. II.2, note 15 (Eunuchus). Cf. above, the hints of Pseudolus that he will defraud his master.

his money from Theotimus (327 ff.). This seems to puzzle Nicobulus (328), but it is very doubtful whether or not this apparently needless direction of Chrysalus can be considered false preparation. At least, one is reminded of the direction of Palaestrio in the Miles (806 ff.). Elaboration of the intrigue beyond its essential limits is found elsewhere in the plays.¹⁷

In the Epidicus, a promissio is made which does not seem to have been carried out. Epidicus says that he will instruct the flute girl with regard to the deception that is being played on the old man (317 f.; 373; 375 f.) in order that she may pretend that she has been bought. But the girl seems to have received no such instruction (as Acropolistis received; cf. 591 f.): she certainly does not practice any deception whatever (411 ff.; 496 ff.).¹⁸

Whatever the true explanation may be of the passage in the Miles in which Palaestrio instructs Pleusicles to call Philocomasium Dicea when the soldier comes home (806 ff., cf. Jachmann, 164 ff.), it is certainly false preparation.¹⁹

In the Persa, the daughter of Saturio seems to have received careful instruction with regard to her assumed parentage, native land, and so forth (148 ff.; 379 ff.), but when the time actually comes for her to parade her lies, she scarcely lies at all, but merely answers in evasive generalities (619 ff.). During the fraud scene, Sagaristio is careful to mention the existence of a twin brother, as if preparing for a later error of identity

¹⁷Cf. above note 4 (Phormio). It is noteworthy that a ring is involved.

¹⁸Cf. Langen, Plaut. Studien, pp. 141 ff.; Wheeler, AJP xxxviii (1917), 239 f.

¹⁹False preparation is occasionally found in Greek tragedy. Cf. Eur. Hel. 1387 ff.

(695 ff.). He does actually meet the slave dealer during the last scene, but little effort is made to deceive him (828 ff.). All this, however, is scarcely more than harmless light comedy.

There is a strange case of false preparation or of inconsistency in the *Poenulus*. It has been agreed that Agorastocles will ask the procurer if his slave is in the procurer's house; the latter will think that Milphio is the slave in question and will straightway deny that the slave is in his house (181 ff.; 563). This is the plan that is actually executed, although the procurer does not seem to err in the expected direction (761 ff.). But just before the plan is executed, Agorastocles proposes and his advocati approve an entirely different device:²⁰

732 AG. -- cum auri ducentis nummis Philippis? ADV. quippini?
ibi extemplo leno errabit. ADV. qua de re? AG. rogas?
quia centum nummis minu' dicetur. ADV. bene putas.

²⁰Jachmann (203 ff.) considers vss. 721 ff. as original with Plautus. Here as in vss. 428 ff. and Tri. 583 ff., Jachmann (201 ff.; 239 ff.) finds Plautine originality, although he (241) admits that such repetition of a word or phrase, altogether at home in Old Comedy, was not entirely foreign to New. To the examples which he cites from Plautus may possibly be added the amusing repetitions of Davus, Epit. 5, 20; 141 ff. An assumption of Plautine originality for such passages is especially unconvincing in the *Poenulus* because of the unusually large number of such repetitions. If Plautus was fond of repetition, why should he have so much of it in one play and little or none in other plays? Not only the repetitions which Jachmann considers occur, but also those of vss. 1296 f.# and 1351 ff. With regard to another feature of vss. 428 ff., Jachmann remarks (202):

Solche krause Phantastik, die hart an der Grenze des Sinnvollen schweift, mag im Stil der alten Komoedie sein, in dem der neuen ist sie nicht.

Still another feature of the *Poenulus*, very characteristic of Old Comedy, though not at all foreign to New, is the repeated and violent breaking of the dramatic illusion (126; 550 ff.; 597 ff.; 920 ff.). Perhaps it is not out of place to recall that Alexis as well as Menander (and possibly others) wrote a comedy entitled Carchedonius (cf. also Gellius, N.A. II 23, 1.). With regard to vss. 721 ff., it would seem a very natural device to have these court loafers (cf. 583 ff.) indulge in a parody of court jargon, and why Plautus should undertake to exhibit his originality by inventing a new method of deception and then not putting it into effect, is not clear. It is much more likely that he translated the passage blindly, and that the unused device is simply another

4. General Future Action

In the *Amphitruo*, the deliverance of *Alcumena* is foreshadowed in the play itself (664 ff.; 718 ff.; 1039) as well as stated in the prologue and quasi-prologues (107 ff.; 486 ff.; 877 ff.). The deluding of *Amphitruo* by *Mercury* is foretold by *Juppiter* (952 f.#; cf. fr. xv; 978 ff.) and *Mercury* (997 ff.).

In the *Eunuchus*, the extreme reluctance of *Phaedria* to give up *Thais* to the soldier for a couple of days and go to the country,²¹ though quite natural, prepares us for his premature return, especially the following lines (cf. 187):

217 ... PH. censen posse me obfirmare et
perpeti ne redeam interea? PA. tene? non hercle arbitror;
nam aut iam revortere aut mox noctu te adiget horsum insomnia.

We are not surprised, then, to see *Phaedria* return (629) in spite of his resolve. On this, the commentator remarks:

224.3 STAT SENTENTIA et uultu et gestu magis spectabile quod
dixit 'stat sententia'. 4 Vel maxime eo, quod tanto sonitu
hoc de se promittat *Phaedria* continuo rediturus uel potius non

superfluous elaboration of an intrigue. *Jachmann* (204 ff.) has further attacked this scene on the grounds that (1) the delay of six lines in delivering the money to the slave dealer (706-13) is highly objectionable; (2) the summoning of *Agorastocles* to witness the transfer is useless and contrary to vss. 604 ff., and, he says (206, note):

... in seiner Ploetzlichkeit und Formlosigkeit wenig dem Stil der neuen Komödie entspricht und selbst in der Besonderheit der Situation kaum eine Rechtfertigung faende.

With regard to the first point, it may be noted that in the *Persa*, *Toxilus* asks *Dordalus* to take the money vs. 412, but that *Dordalus* does not seem to get his hands on it before vs. 437. The informal way in which *Agorastocles* is summoned and the suddenness with which he appears, seem to me quite native to the style of New Comedy. Cf. Po. 207 (often considered the result of contamination, cf. above, Sec. II.2, n. 25); Ph. 986; Mi. 522 ff. etc.

²¹

Cf. *Biduom*, 187, 190; *triduom*, 223 f.

Eu. 206 constitutes a mere exit motivation, in my opinion. But *Donatus* remarks:

206 ATQVE EXSPECTABO DVM VENIT futurum actum uoluit promittere,
non quo aliquis gestus sit expectantis. (cf. app. crit.)

accessurus ad uillam. tantum autem aberit, quantum temporis opus est ad utiandam uirginem.

The dream of Demipho in the Mercator foreshadows most of the action of the play. He himself identifies the she goat with the beautiful girl whom his son has brought (268), and although he admits that he cannot imagine who the ape or the kid may be, it is significant that he introduces his neighbor in the very next line (269 ff.).²² The first words of his neighbor are ominous, suggesting that Demipho is a he goat and that he will come to grief (272 ff.). Here Demipho makes a false interpretation by assigning the part of the ape to his wife (276). This is a disconcerting note. He has already reported that in his dream he did not take the she goat home because he already had one there (230 f.). In the dream Demipho thought that he purchased a beautiful (cf. 13; 101; 210 f.; 260) she goat, he gave her to an ape for safe-keeping. The ape quarreled with him, saying that he (the ape) had become involved in great difficulties over the goat, who completely ate up his wife's dowry (therefore, the ape was a man, not a woman). Demipho was surprised that one goat could eat the dowry of the ape's wife, and the ape threatened to lead the she goat to Demipho's wife unless he himself took her away quickly (240 ff.). Demipho did not have any one to whom he could intrust the goat, and was in a dreadful dilemma when a kid came up, announced that he had led the goat away from the ape, and then began to make fun of him (245 ff.). Demipho then became very sad over her loss. The small part of this that is not immediately understood, becomes clear as the action progresses: Demipho gets possession of the girl, gives her to Lysidamus for safe keeping; Lysidamus' wife discovers her, and Lysidamus is threatened with the loss of his wife and her dowry; Lysidamus quarrels with Demipho, but does not

²²Cf. Hec. 570 ff.

threaten to lead the girl to Demipho's wife (cf. 797 ff.); Eutychus announces the reunion of the lovers and, along with Lysidamus, ridicules Demipho, who appears to be more ashamed of being discovered than sad over his loss. He is at least assured, however, that his wife will not discover his sins (1003 ff.).²³

²³Whether or not this dream is a Plautine addition is a much disputed point. Enk (Plauti Mercator, Lugduni Batavorum, Sijthoff, 1932, pp. 7 ff.) considers the question at length and concludes that the whole of the dream is taken from the Greek original. Leo (P.F. 162 ff.) argues against the assumption of Marx (Sitzb. d. Wiener Akad., 1899, no. viii) that it is a Plautine addition. Fraenkel (198 ff.), however, supports Marx' assumption. One of Fraenkel's main objections to assuming Attic authorship is the fact that the monologue is not a unity: the dream is related, and apparently definitely concluded (252-4); then the visit to the ship and the discovery of the girl is related; then the dream is again picked up (268-70). Fraenkel remarks (201):

... der plautinische Monolog zwei Berichte in einer Weise verbindet, die fuer die konstante Technik der neueren Komödie schlechterdings unerhoert ist.

But it may be denied that this monologue wherein the dream is related lacks unity: the visit to the ship explains and interprets the dream. As Leo (P.F. 164) points out, it is normal for the character to relate his dream upon his first appearance. (But as a parallel to the position of the dream in the *Rudens*, cf. the omen in the *Stichus*, vss. 459 ff.). It is evident that the last of the monologue must turn on the capra-simia-haedus allegory if the opening lines of the next scene (which Fraenkel admits are the work of Philemon) are to have their full point (i.e., if they are to suggest that Demipho is the mate of the goat and to foreshadow his coming misfortune), and if the Lysimachus-simia identity is to be suggested immediately. These effects are among the most subtle of the play, although Fraenkel insists that vss. 268-70 are a Plautine joining. Any transposition of lines would spoil these effects. (Cf. Fraenkel, 203) Fraenkel is perverse when he denies that there is any connection between the lines of Philemon (272-275) and the Plautine dream simply because Demipho is not represented in the dream as a goat. Since the dream hinges about a she goat, it is perfectly obvious that the he goat mentioned only a few lines later (272; 275) has the very closest connection with the dream. The identity is not only stressed here, but is picked up later (575). It cannot be denied, however, that there are at least two inconsistencies connected with the dream: the threat to lead the goat to Demipho's wife does not find any sequel in the action (but cf. 1003 ff.), and the identity of the ape is blurred (cf. 241 and 276). It is to be noted that this second difficulty is not solved by the assumption that the dream is a Plautine invention. Vs. 276 is "nachplautinisch" in the opinion of Fraenkel (206). How serious these inconsistencies are is a matter of opinion, but in view of minor inconsistencies in plays not suspected of contamination and even in Greek tragedy, I am certainly unwilling to assume both Plautine originality and a

Daemones' report of his dream in the Rudens, vss. 593 ff., foreshadows in a general way Labrax' attempt to drag off Palaestra and Ampelisca, and the encounter between Daemones and Labrax. The identification of the swallows as Daemones' fellow citizens is also significant. The ape's bringing suit against Daemones, and the latter's casting the ape into chains find only vague echoes in the following action (cf. 710 ff.). But the ape's approaching Daemones of his own accord and asking aid in his attempt to rob the swallows' nest seem to be out of harmony with the subsequent action. This lack of mechanical preciseness is found also in the dream in the Mercator.

later interpolation. The strongest argument against the assumption of Plautine originality appears to me to be the fact that inconsistencies are found also in the dream in the Rudens.

III. PREPARATION FOR INCIDENTAL PHASES OF ACTION

1. Complication

In the *Andria*, Pamphilus' wrath at his slave Davos for inducing him to enter upon a pretence which promises to bring disastrous consequences is prepared for by Pamphilus' warning Davos that he should be careful what he is about (399 ff.). The commentator remarks (cf. 607.1):

399.3 Bona οἰκονομία, ut mox iuste Dauo succenseat Pamphilus.

In the *Heauton*, Syrus warns Clitipho when temptation herself (*Bacchis*) is about to be brought into the house:

sed heus tu, vide sis nequid inprudens ruas!
370 patrem novisti ad has res quam sit perspicax;
ego te autem novi quam esse soleas inpotens ...

This warning is not heeded: Chremes catches his son making love to *Bacchis*, whom he nevertheless continues to think not his son's mistress but *Clinia's* (562 ff.). Still, the scene is embarrassing enough for Clitipho, and it aids somewhat Chremes' eventual enlightenment (906 ff.).¹

The exposure of Chremes' double life in the *Phormio* is foreshadowed in a general way by stressing his fear of such an exposure, and the direful consequences that would result:

585 vereorque ne uxor aliqua hoc resciscat mea:
quod si fit, ut me excutiam atque egrediar domo
id restat; nam ego meorum solu' sum meus.

His own poverty and the wealth of his wife constitute a neat device not only for heightening the danger of his exposure, but also

¹Cf. the discovery of Ctesipho in the *Adelphoe*, and Donatus ad *Ad.* 539.

for motivating his wife's wrath even before she has discovered his major offenses. When Chremes offers to pay off Phormio from the money which he has brought with him from Lemnos, the profit of his wife's estate, the commentator remarks:

679 MECVVM ARGENTVM ATTVLI comicum: argentum praesto est et causa additur, cur praesto sit et unde. Simul et iracundiae uxoris et iurgio praeparatur locus.

When Nausistrata first appears on stage (784), she has little to say about the actual matter in hand, but much about the mismanagement of her husband (787 ff.). The commentator says:

784 AGEDVM VT SOLES NAVSISTRATA diuitis uxoris de marito licentius conquerentis haec allocutio est cum dispositione futurarum turbarum.

After Chremes discovers that his daughter is already married to Demipho's son, Chremes' own exposure is practically all that is left of possible dramatic action, and it accordingly again begins to be stressed. He implores Sophrona not to let anybody know that the girl is his daughter (764). He warns his brother that he does not wish their sons to know the true state of affairs (819). Thus, by continually emphasizing the importance of keeping his secret, he foreshadows its revelation, and after the true climax of the play, focuses the audience's attention upon his own predicament rather than upon that of Antipho and Phanium.

In the *Menaechmi*, Messenio describes the Epidamnians as champion voluptuaries and drinkers, sycophants and flatterers, the most persuasive courtesans in the world (258 ff.). This description serves as preparation for the scenes with Cylindrus and Erotium (cf. 333 ff.; 375 ff.), and perhaps some of the later scenes of the play. Other preparation occurs in the *Menaechmi*. Peniculus swears revenge upon his patron for running away, as he thinks, to the lunch and drinking party alone (471 f.). After his very unsatisfactory scene with Menaechmus Sosicles, he declares

that he will tell his patron's wife (518 ff.), and this he proceeds to do. The wife says that she will reveal her husband's outrages to her father (738); her father reveals his intention of summoning servants (954 ff.).

2. False Preparation for Complication

In the *Andria*, it may fairly be considered false preparation when Simo instructs Sosia to terrify Davos and to watch his son (168 ff.), but Sosia disappears entirely from the play.² Donatus says that Sosia is a cook (ad 171), and that this is what he refers to when he says curabo (171; cf. 29 ff.). But from vss. 168 ff., we might fairly expect Sosia to appear again in the play. Quite the opposite from this is the case of *Byrrria*, who is rudely dismissed (337) not only without orders to do any spying, but apparently with orders not to meddle in the business at all. Nevertheless, he is awkwardly lugged on stage (412) saying that his master has ordered him to watch Pamphilus.³

In the *Menaechmi* the Epidamnian twin swears bloody vengeance upon his parasite (903), but we hear no more of this.⁴

²Cf. Callipho in the *Pseudolus*. It may be that this promise finds its true explanation in the assumption of contamination. I point out, however, that in Euripides' *Ion*, Hermes near the end of his prologue speech expresses his intention of retiring to the laurel vales in order that he may observe the fulfillment of Ion's destiny (76 f.). I offer the suggestion that probably in Euripides and possibly in the *Pseudolus*, such expressions of interest in the play and its outcome, evidenced by persons only loosely connected with it, constitute a subtle device for arousing the interest of the audience. Note the following lines of Callipho in the *Pseudolus* and compare them with the lines of Euripides:

551 nunc non abire certum est istac gratia;
lubidost ludos tuos spectare, Pseudole.

³For a discussion of the source and handling of the two characters, Charinus and *Byrrria*, cf. Schoell, *Sitzb. Heidelb. Akad.*, 1912. Cf. Clifford, *Class. Jour.* XXVI (1931), 609 ff. Cf. Donatus ad An. 301.2.

⁴The *Menaechmi* reaches a satisfactory conclusion only with respect to the chief theme of the play: the reunion of the brothers, and the freeing of the faithful slave. These results

2. Events Incident to the Happy Ending

After Demea's reversal of character in the *Adelphoe*, a pose assumed merely for the time being,⁵ he throws out hints of the radical proposals which he is soon to make. The proposal that Micio marry (933) is ingenuously introduced with the command to dig through the garden division wall and make one family out of the two (908). The reference to marriage in 811 (cf. 28 ff.) could hardly be construed as preparation.⁶ Demea's proposal to set Syrus free (959 f.) is foreshadowed by the lines:

886 DE. servom haud inliberalem praebes te et tibi
lubens bene faxim. SY. gratiam habeo. DE. atqui, Syre,
hoc verumst et ipsa re experiere propediem.

Similar to this is his promise to Geta (891 ff.), which is fulfilled by making the two families one (cf. 917 ff.). The commentator remarks:

895.2 ET TIBI OB EAM REM SI QUID VSVS VENERIT ... hae autem
promissiones ad hoc praemittuntur, ut cum in subiectis agi
a Demea huiusmodi res coeperint, non sit absurdum spectatoribus
Demeam tam cito esse mutatum.

The reconciliation of the old men with their sons at the end of the *Bacchides* is of course foreseen as inevitable for the

are achieved at the expense of the other characters in the play. The parasite loses his patron and is threatened with dire vengeance. Erotium loses her love. Such losses are of no great importance, and after the error has been resolved, the seriousness of these quarrels vanishes. But the more important problem, the quarrel between husband and wife, is not very much affected by the error or its resolution. Divorce seems imminent (cf. 112 f., Fraenkel, 144; 719 ff.). The most obvious explanation of this unsatisfactory ending though possibly not the correct one, is simply that the play is a poor play and in all probability was such in the Greek original.

⁵Cf. 838; 877 ff.; 985 ff.; Donatus ad 881; 992; 986.3. Cf. Legrand, 557.

⁶In speaking of the marriage of Micio, Leo (*Gesch.* 245) says:

... Menander diesen Gedanken irgendwie vorbereitet und annehmbar gemacht hatte.

But cf. *Hea.*, *Peri.*, *Tri.*, considered below.

happy ending, but it receives very little preparation. The words of Philoxenus just before the final scenes (1079 ff.) reveal the fact that he, at least, is not a very formidable menace to his son's happiness, and it comes as no surprise that Philoxenus is the first to weaken before the attack of the sisters (1155 ff.).

In the *Epitrepontes*, Habrotonon is very anxious to secure her freedom, and to this end she designs her scheme to have Charisius admit that the child is his (321 ff.; 331 f.; ?? 562). It is usually assumed that she gained her purpose, and that in the end, she became the sweetheart of Chaerestratus (cf. 585 ff.; ?? 626 f.; cf. Jensen xxviii f.). It is sometimes assumed that Onesimus also is freed at the end of the play (cf. 325). At least he expresses his despair of ever becoming free (343 ff.).

The freeing of Messenio in the *Menaechmi* receives some little preparation. During his first appearance on stage, Messenio makes it clear that he is not altogether satisfied with the lot of slavery (251). When he has rescued the *Menaechmus* who is not his master, his first thought is freedom (1023 ff.). This *Menaechmus* is willing enough to free him (1029; cf. 1044). His master, however, is of a quite different opinion: he would prefer to become a slave himself rather than to free Messenio (1058 f.). But when the recognition of the brother is imminent, he readily volunteers to free Messenio (1093) and even promises to be a slave to him (1101).

When Gripus comes upon the stage with the trunk in the *Rudens*, his dreams of becoming free and making a million dollars (927 ff.; cf. 1388) foreshadows Daemones' promise to free him at the end of the play (1410). The conversation between Daemones and Trachalio (1217 ff.) makes it plain that Trachalio, too, will be freed, and the words of his master Plesidippus confirm this

impression (1265 f.) although no definite statement is made as to the fact. Trachalio's request that he be allowed to marry Ampelisca when he has become free (1220) paves the way for the later proposition by which she, too, becomes free (1405 ff.).

In the Eunuchus when Thais tells Phaedria that she is especially anxious to restore Pamphila to her family in order that she herself may thereby acquire friends, having neither kin nor friends at Athens (144 ff.), she is not merely inventing an excuse, as is shown by subsequent references to the same subject. At vs. 770, she says that Chremes, whom she has taken for her protector, is in need of a patron himself. Toward the end of the play (1038 ff.), Chaerea relates that Thais has taken his father as her patron and commended herself to his protection.

Syrus in the Heauton reveals his intention of appealing to Menedemus to intercede with Chremes in his behalf (1001 f.). Menedemus does intercede (1045 ff.), but it is solely in behalf of the son, Clitipho. The latter, however, secures pardon for Syrus.

The humiliation of Demaenetus, which, paradoxically, results in the happy ending of the Asinaria, is not very clearly foreshadowed. At the beginning of the play (91), he commands Libanus, me defrudato. This is a dangerous command to give a servus callidus, and might possibly warrant the inference that the old man will be more of a victim than he had intended, especially when one recalls the fate of Chremes in the Heauton. After the conditions upon which the money is furnished Argyrippus have been stated (736), we find lines that may arouse a suspicion of what is to come:

741 ... angiporto
illac per hortum circum iit clam, ne quis se uideret
huc ire familiarium: ne uxor resciscat metuit.

Shortly afterwards (811 ff.) Diabolus announces his intention of exposing Demaenetus to his wife.

In the *Pseudolus*, the birthday dinner of Ballio is conspicuous in the first half of the play (165 ff.; 790 ff.), but is lost sight of during the latter half, where a drinking party and dinner seem more or less hurriedly to be arranged by Pseudolus and his companions in arms to celebrate the successful achievement of their plans (946 ff.; 1051, cf. Fraenkel, 235; cf. 1246 ff., Fraenkel 106; 191).

The dinner in the *Rudens* to which Labrax and all the spectators under sixteen are invited (1417 ff.; cf. Ph. 1053 f.; Ps. 1327 ff.) is planned immediately after the recognition takes place (1215, cf. Jachmann 16 f.; 1264).

The dinner customarily given in honor of a safe arrival comes in for considerable attention in the *Stichus*. Pinacium gives orders for its preparation (359 f.), Epignomus announces that his father-in-law and his brother will dine with him (415; cf. 510 ff.), and Gelasimus has a very difficult time extracting an invitation from him (470 ff.; 588 ff.). This dull family affair, however, is completely lost sight of when the slaves' drinking party and dinner gets under way. This is also foreshadowed when Stichus receives a cask of wine and permission to take the day off (419 ff.; cf. Fraenkel, 111 f.).⁷

a. False Preparation or Notable Lack of Preparation
Incident to the Happy Ending

In the *Eunuchus*, although there is perhaps some slight

⁷The *Stichus* is often considered contaminated (Leo, P.F. 168 f.; Fraenkel, 278 ff.). From the point of view of the present study, the only false preparation occurs in the giving up of this family dinner. In view of other such dinners which are lost sight of, this does not seem to be of any significance as far as the problem of contamination is concerned. Cf. *Mostellaria* and *Truculentus*, and Fraenkel's remarks on Mi. 738 and 749, above, sec. II. 3, n.10.

preparation for the soldier's becoming reconciled to the loss of Thais (446 and Donatus ad hoc), there is no preparation for the reconciliation between Phaedria and the soldier (1072 ff.).

In the Heauton, there is no preparation for the marriage of Clitipho (cf. 1056 ff.).

In the Trinummus, there is no preparation for the marriage of Lesbonicus.

The marriage of Moschio in the Pericliomene, a consolation match, as it were, seems to be an affair of the moment (446 ff.), and receives no preparation whatever in the extant fragments. Likewise, the freeing of Doris which Polemo promises (404 f.) is not foreshadowed in the fragments.

The conversation between Apocides and Periphanes in the Epidicus (166 ff.) prepares for the appearance of Philippa. So do Periphanes' confessions (382 ff.; 432 ff.). But the advice of Apocides leads one to expect Periphanes' marriage.⁸ The case of the son is a more complicated one. He is presented as very much in love with his captive (64 f.; 135; 148; 362 f.); Epidicus'

⁸ It has frequently been pointed out that the marriage of Periphanes and Philippa is foreshadowed and expected. Cf. Fraenkel, 319; Jachmann, 218, Wheeler, AJP xxxviii (1917), pp. 237 ff. Wheeler thinks that the play as we now have it differs in many important respects from the Greek original. He is influenced especially by the unusual obscurity and lack of explanations with regard to the trickery of the slave. Jachmann (209 ff.) argues in favor of the widely accepted hypothesis of Dziatzko (Rh. Mus. LV (1900), 104 ff.) that in the original of the Epidicus, Stratippocles married Telestis, his half sister, but that Plautus changed this ending to avoid outraging Roman morals. Wheeler accepts this theory, but Fraenkel (313 ff.) argues that the ending of the original is retained substantially unchanged. His argument is attractive because of the parallels which he cites. Jachmann falls into sentimentality (215 f.; cf. above, sec. II. 1a, n. 11):

Dass Epidicus es ueberhaupt gewagt hat ihm als Ersatz fuer eine grosse und tiefe Liebe wieder jene liaison mit einer Dirne zuzumuten, die fuer ihn laengst jeden Reiz verloren hat, ... und dass er sogar darauf eingeht, das ist so ueberaus roh und primitiv, so unwuerdig eines feineren Menschentums, dass wir uns ehrlich freuen das Werk des attischen Dichters von diesem Makel befreit zu sehen.

reference to the son's being compelled to marry (267; 282 f.; cf. 190 ff., 361 ff.), although within the deceptive intriguing, is

From the point of view of preparation, the one event which is definitely foreshadowed without taking place is the marriage of Periphanes and Philippa. Whether or not the marriage of the son could be expected is a matter of opinion, but the dramatic convenience of the proposal must certainly be taken into consideration. It is evident that the father gives no hint of an intention to marry his daughter to her half-brother, nor does the son himself give any hint of an intention of marrying his captive slave. The play reaches no definite conclusion with regard to Periphanes and Philippa, but the interest of the author seems to have been centered upon Epidicus, as the very name of the play suggests, and with regard to him, the play certainly reaches an altogether happy ending. Regardless of the original solution, Jachmann (224) is particularly unfortunate in his choice of this play to illustrate "die Feinheit der attischen Technik." Just how vague and how different the notions of two scholars can be with regard to Attic technique is excellently illustrated by their treatment of Epid 648 ff., where Fraenkel (316 f.) speaks of "die Farbe und die Feinheit des attischen Dialogs," "das Ineingreifen des Gesprachsteils," "die Urbanitaet dieses Stils," "das leise Pathos des Originals," and "Meisterschaft in der Fuehrung des Dialogs." Jachmann (212 ff.), however, far from recognizing Attic art, immediately discerns the clumsy pen of Plautus: (Jachmann, 215)

Seine Handschrift wurde sofort kenntlich in der floskelhaften Phraseologie des V. 651 -- hier schneidet er den Faden des Originals ab ...

Compare the dispute between Jachmann and Marx over Ru. 338 (Jachmann, 89). Another amusing disagreement is that of Norwood and Fraenkel over Ps. 1ff. Norwood waxes eloquent (Plautus and Terence, p. 76):

"The complication begins with no delay and no haste: the very first words of the play are Pseudolus' inquiry into his master's trouble. An unforced elegance of style matches this deftness of manipulation: this scene is perhaps the most Attic passage in Plautus ... Consider Pseudolus' first speech to Calidorus. It is unmistakable New Comedy Greek -- not beautiful or pungent, simply urbane and winning. Moreover it seems to contain a reminiscence of the admirable prologue to Euripides' Iphigenia at Aulis ... "

Yet these opening lines of the Pseudolus are the very lines which Fraenkel (413 ff.) chooses to illustrate Plautus' stylistic vices when compared with Menander. Norwood again clashes with Fraenkel over the famous monody of Chrysalus. Norwood says (op. cit., p. 75):

"Here are to be added those Greek passages that we mentioned briefly when describing the Mercator. The most unmistakable of these occurs in Bacchides (925-978), very good though much too long. ... The passage is cleverly worked out and is plainly a close translation of a Greek passage that specially struck Plautus' imagination; otherwise he would not

prompted by the plan of Apocides and Periphanes⁹ (193) and might be considered ominous. There is no question that Stratippocles was once very fond of Acropolistis (219 ff.; cf. 45 ff., Jachmann 223 ff.; 87 ff.), but now he has changed his mind (138). Still, at the end of the play as it stands, he does not seem very much upset by the loss of Telestis, especially since his old love is at hand (648 ff.).

When Tranio sets off at the beginning of the *Mostellaria* for the Piraeus (66), he says that he wishes to purchase fish for the evening's dinner (67; cf. 363). This is possibly a mere motivation,¹⁰ but it is entirely plausible. Needless to say, the fish and the dinner are both abandoned in the press of circumstances. There is no preparation for Callidamates' becoming the intercessor at the end of the play.

When Toxilus in the *Persa* undertakes to persuade Saturio to assist him in his intrigue, he warns the audience that he is deliberately undertaking to inveigle the parasite (83 f.). In spite of this, the audience might fairly expect, as the parasite himself certainly does, that the parasite would enjoy a dinner and drinking party after the successful completion of the intrigue (cf. 104 ff.; 140 ff.). Apparently, however, the parasite does not receive his reward, at least during the play. In this regard, economy of roles is an important consideration since five other

have kept all these detailed identifications with Greek heroes, some at least of whom, such as Epius and Sino, can hardly have touched a chord in many hearts among his audience."

⁹As Fraenkel (315 f.) points out, this plan must be considered in connection with the intrigue (i.e., it is dramatically necessary).

¹⁰Cf. Fraenkel's remarks on *Mi.* 738, 749, above, sec. II. 3, n. 10. Cf. the banquet of Ballio in *Pseudolus* and the family banquet in the *Stichus*. Cf. *Truculentus*, below.

persons are present in the final scene.¹¹ On the other hand, there is no preparation for the final reconciliation with the slave dealer.

A dinner is promised Diniarchus by Astaphium in the Truculentus in honor of his safe return (127) and by Phronesium -- with reservations (359 ff.), but no such dinner takes place, although Diniarchus furnishes the provisions (740 ff.). It would have interfered with Phronesium's designs, and after the scene with Callicles, Diniarchus himself would hardly have been inclined to participate.

In the Mercator, Charinus promises to free Acanthio -- in a few months (152 f.), but this slave is entirely lost sight of in the later action of the play.

Some lines of the Trinummus might lead the audience to expect the freeing of Stasimus (440; 619; cf. 564, Jachmann, 234 f.).

In the Poenulus, we might fairly expect the freeing of Milphio to contribute to the happy ending (129 ff.; 420; 429), and perhaps even the freeing of Syncerastus (909 ff.), but neither event takes place.

From vs. 358, we might possibly expect the freeing of Pseudolus in the Pseudolus. But here and in the other cases where we might expect the freeing of a slave which does not actually take place, we must not accuse the dramatist of an error though he may be guilty of a natural inconsistency. The experienced playgoer could immediately grasp the significance of preparation for recognition, and if deceived, as he would have been in the Adelphoe,

¹¹ On the distribution of roles in this play and its bearing upon the absence of the parasite in the final scene, cf. Prescott, Clas. Phil. xi (1916), 129, who mentions other factors to be reckoned with and cites various scholars who have found fault with the Persa because of this inconsistency.

he might well have felt offended; but experience in life off, as well as on, the stage would have taught him that vague invitations and ready promises frequently fall by the wayside. He would also have learned that the dramatist is relatively careless with regard to preparation for incidental action.

3. General Future Action

In the *Adelphoe*, Sannio, robbed of his slave girl and left alone on the stage, spends the time in making conjectures about getting money for her (201 ff.). Although he himself admits that this is all idle speculation, we may find in this a foreshadowing of the settlement of the dispute by the payment of the twenty minae. So thinks the commentator, at least:

208 FRVSTRA EGOMET MECVM praeparationis genus ad accipiendas
uiginti minas totius summa est disputationis.

The dinner and drinking party which occurs later in the play is repeatedly foreshadowed (285 f.; 376 ff.; 588 ff.).

The appearance of Demipho, the father of Selenium, at the very end of the *Cistellaria* (774 ff.) is foreshadowed by the lines of Lampadio:

592 uir tuo' si ueniet, iube domi opperirier,
ne in quaestione mihi sit, si quid eum uelim.

The low comedy buffeting in the *Asinaria* (407 ff.) is previously announced (371 ff.), although at that time Libanus declared that he intended to retaliate (377). This intention, dangerous to Leonida's impersonation, is not carried out. Again, in the scene between the procuress and Argyrippus, the former suggests the signing of a contract (238). Argyrippus does not carry out this suggestion within the play, but his rival, Diabolus appears with such a contract, and a very clever one, which his parasite has drawn up and which is read aloud (746-809).

The dream of Cappadox in the *Curculio* and its unfavorable

interpretation may possibly be considered preparation for his financial loss at the end of the play (cf. 270 ff.; 557 f., Fraenkel, 167).

In the *Truculentus*, Diniarchus promises Phronesium to send her some little something (428), and later confirms his intention in a monologue (443 ff.). His slave appears with the gifts, vs. 551.

a. False Preparation for General Future Action

In the *Casina*, Cleustrata tells Myrrhina that they will continue their conversation when they have more time (215 f.; cf. 545; 548); but no continuation of the conversation takes place on stage (cf. 613; 687). Near the end of the play, Cleustrata calls out Pardalisca to make sport of Lysidamus, apparently (867 f.; cf. 862 f), although when Pardalisca appears on stage, she makes sport only of Olympio (892 ff.) according to the line assignment of Lindsay. According to others (e.g., Leo), she has no speeches whatever in the scenes which follow her entrance. If she makes sport only of Olympio, the inconsistency is of no importance. One is reminded of Phormio 238 ff. Further, it is to be remarked that the conversation between Olympio and his interlocutor is perhaps beneath the dignity of matrons, while the mocking of Lysidamus is more effective if done by his wife and her friend.¹

¹Fraenkel (310; cf. 306) remarks on vss. 867 f.:

Da ist es nun, wie Langen mit Recht bemerkt (Plaut. Stud. 128), sehr auffaellig, dass Pardalisca von hier an in dem Stueck ueberhaupt nicht mehr vorkommt. Es zeigte sich schon, dass nach dem urspruenglichen Plane von V 1 nicht "der Heraustretende" (867) und nicht Olympio, sondern Lysidamus erwartet wurde und dass dem die plautinische Handlung widerspricht; ...

Jachmann (118 f.) agrees with Fraenkel, but offers a different explanation: it is due not to contamination but to a shortened

In the *Pseudolus*, Callipho at the insistence of Pseudolus promises to forego his earlier plans and to watch Pseudolus play his trick and to see to it that Pseudolus actually receives the money promised him (547 ff.). Since he appears in the play only in this scene, this promise is false preparation.²

1. Excursus on Quasi-Preparation³

The Punishment of a Slave.- Punishment for the supposed misdeeds of Sosia is repeatedly threatened in the *Amphitruo* (551 ff.; 1002; 1021 ff.; fr. I). This trifling matter is not noticed in the general amnesty at the end of the play.

ending. According to Lindsay, Pardalisca does have a considerable part in the action after she is summoned, and it is to be noted that in the play as it stands, or in any such play where both Olympio and Lysidamus were to appear and be mocked, it is essential for the minor character to appear first. His appearance second would be an anti-climax. The assignment of Lindsay follows that of Schoell, and it is distinctly unfair merely to say that Pardalisca has no part in the following action, since in these scenes, line assignments are missing in the MSS. One is tempted to conclude that a bare statement of this sort is a result of following some edition (e.g., Leo's) without noting the critical apparatus.

²The dropping of this role is frequently considered one of the most important evidences of contamination. Cf. Legrand 364; Hough, Composition of the Pseudolus, Princeton diss., 1931, pp. 65 ff., and Prescott, Class. Phil. XV (1920), 255 f.; Jachmann, 251. I have suggested another explanation for the dropping of this role, above, sec. III. 1a, n. 2.

³Here are included some instances of what appears to be preparation (foreshadowing), but actually is only a means of heightening the timor or periculum of the play (cf. Prescott, Class. Phil., XXIV (1929), 32 ff.). That is, the events which appear to be foreshadowed are hardly possible in New Comedy. No matter what is said, the audience knows that the clever slave will not be punished severely, no one will really commit suicide, etc. The scene in the *Perinthia* is often termed a scene of brutal slave torturing (e.g., Frank, AJP XLIX (1928), 318 n. 11). But is not this scene similar to that at the end of the *Mostellaria*, and are we not to assume that Davus in the *Perinthia* was rescued before any actual punishment took place, as Tranio is in the *Mostellaria*? I imagine that any ancient audience enjoyed such scenes immensely, and perhaps a modern audience with the exception of a few timid souls would do the same. Duckworth (Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius, and Vergil, Princeton, 1933, pp. 109 ff.) considers some phenomena false foreshadowing which I should term quasi-foreshadowing. Aenid XII 403 is a

In the *Bacchides*, just punishment for his misdeeds hangs like the sword of Damocles over the head of Chrysalus throughout the play. He expresses his own misgivings (358 ff., cf. Fraenkel, 23); Mnesilochus, before returning the money to his father, promises to secure pardon for Chrysalus (521 ff.), and afterwards reports that he has secured this pardon but only with great difficulty (532 f.; cf. 686 ff.). Chrysalus again mentions his risks and his misgivings (752; 762); Nicobulus talks ominously (777 ff.); Chrysalus compares his dangerous position to that of Ulysses discovered by Helen (962 ff.). When Nicobulus finally discovers the deception, he swears vengeance upon Chrysalus (1183a f.), but he is soon inticed into declaring a general amnesty (1199 ff.).

In the *Epidicus*, the servus callidus is as usual threatened with dire punishment which never matures. *Epidicus* expresses his own forebodings.⁴ His young master also threatens him (121 ff.; 145). Later, *Epidicus* determines upon flight (615), but again as usual, this decision is reversed (664 f.) when circumstances take a more favorable turn. *Stratippocles* and his sister promise to intercede with their father in his behalf (658 f., cf. 677), and they actually do so when the proper time comes (cf. 721).

Tranio in the *Mostellaria*, is, of course, repeatedly threatened with the punishment that never takes place. *Grumio* looks forward to sweet revenge when *Tranio* will be punished by being sent to the country (4; 17 ff.; 49 ff.; 70 ff.). *Tranio* himself has misgivings (348 ff. and passim). *Simo* speaks words of ill omen (742 f.). Lastly there is no ambiguity about *Theopropides'* request for slaves and straps (1038), and about the

case in point. Here the reader knows that *Aeneas* cannot die from the wound that he has received. But all this is hardly more than a matter of terminology.

⁴*Epid.* 50; 81 ff.; 310 f., cf. Fraenkel 25; 610 ff.

directions which he later gives these slaves (1064 ff.).

Suicide

Defeat in love is a dreadful thing, and at the very thought of it, Chalinus in the *Casina* determines upon suicide (111 f.), but when faced with the actual defeat, he decides that suicide would be a waste of time and money, and would give his enemies too much pleasure (424 ff.). Still, there is a possibility of his changing his mind (447 f.). Lysidamus himself contemplates the same escape in case the lots do not favor him (307 f., cf. Fraenkel, 25), and when he is discovered and disgraced at the end of the play, he determines upon flight (954). None of these dire plans, of course, is fulfilled.

The ominous threats of Alcesimarchus in the *Cistellaria* make plausible his appearance near the end of the play with sword and with the intention of making away with himself.⁵ His slave has advised him to hang himself -- so that his mistress might not be angry with him (249 f.; cf. ? 277#). He himself first determines upon going off to war (284 ff.),⁶ but later decides that he was not in his right mind when he conceived such an idea (296). He threatens to kill both Selenium and Melaenis two or three times over unless Selenium is restored to him (522 f.), and Melaenis herself has apprehensions that he may do something violent in his madness (531).⁷

Charinus in the *Mercator* contemplates suicide after he has been bested by his father with regard to the disposition of Pasicompsa (472; cf. 483). After he hears that the girl has been

⁵The true explanation of this strange appearance may lie in dramatic convenience. Perhaps the economy of roles would not allow all the characters concerned in the recognition to be on the stage at the same time, and this seemed to be a good device to motivate the exit of Melaenis and Selenium.

⁶Cf. Samia 282 ff., especially 314 ff.

⁷Editors vary on this line, reading amans or amens. The

sold to an unknown man, he terminates upon exile.⁸ He returns very suddenly, however, when he learns that the girl is in the house of Eutychnus (cf. 947 ff.).⁹

Talk of *Lesbonicus*' setting out as a soldier of fortune would hardly be taken seriously in the *Trinummus* (595 ff.; 698 ff.; 718 ff.).

Divorce

The divorce of Charisius and Pamphila contemplated in the *Epitrepontes* by Smicrines (?? 420 ff.; 440 ff.; 628 ff.), and hinted at by Onesimus (351 ff.), can hardly be considered preparation in a comedy.

Likewise, the divorce in the *Hecyra* (101 and passim) can hardly have been taken seriously.¹⁰

variation probably does not affect the sense: if *amans* is read, it is a play upon *amens*. Cf. Mer. 82; An. 218. The play is facilitated by the fact that love was considered a disease or aberration. Cf. An. 309 (and Donatus ad Eu. 58); Eu. 61 ff., etc. MSS. variations between the two words occur here (Cis. 531: *amens* Bl), and Cis. 222 (*amentem* Bl). Cf. also Ba. 622 (*amens* Sarac.). Poenulus 140 reads (with Lindsay's critical note):

AG. *amans* per amorem si quid feci[t], Milphio,
AG. *amans* Weise: *adamans* cod. (pro Ad (gorastocles)(ita in
tit. scaenae) *amans*)

I think that this restored text is probably the proper one here (cf. Po. 144: *amanti*). It is just possible, however, that the *nota personae*, Greek alpha, has become confused with the line, and that the first word of the line was originally *demens* (cf. Po. 204). *Ademens* would, of course, quickly become *adamans* (for the form, cf. Ernout-Meillet, *Dict. Ety.*, s.v. *adamas*). The idea of mental aberration is of course present in this line also.

⁸ Cf. Mer. 644, cf. Fraenkel, 60 note; 658 ff.; 830 ff., cf. Leo, P.F. 134.

⁹ Cf. Ad. 274 f., and the following comments in Donatus:

275.1 PAENE EX PATRIA deest 'fugere,' quia amatores comici cito comminantur patriam se deserturos, ut amicam consequantur.
2 ... Menander mori illum uoluisse fingit, Terentius profugere. (Cf. app. crit.)

Gripius in the *Rudens* also talks of suicide, but not very seriously (e.g., 1189 f.; 1288 f.).

¹⁰ Cf. *Menaechmi*, considered above, sec. III. 1a, n.4.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates the success with which a small phase of ancient dramatic theory can be applied to the plays of Menander, Plautus, and Terence. As pointed out in the introduction, the terms used by the ancient commentators to refer to this phenomenon and other similar phenomena are found also in rhetorical theory, and it may be that they originated here and that the critical recognition of them in the drama is due to the recognition of such phenomena in rhetoric. Whatever source may be responsible for the recognition of dramatic preparation, it is obvious from this study that the poets of New Comedy were actively concerned with preparation, and that they consciously and regularly employed it. It is also obvious that the ancient commentators recognized this preparation even in its most subtle manifestations.

More important results of this study, however, are the numerous small corrections made with regard to modern theories concerning ancient dramatic technique. Thus the abandoned dinner in the *Miles* loses its importance when viewed in the light of similar phenomena in the *Mostellaria*, *Pseudolus*, *Stichus*, and *Truculentus*.¹ The hasty marriage proposal at the end of the *Adelphoe* may have received some preparation in Menander, but there is no real basis for assuming that it did, as equally hasty matches are made in the *Pericciromene*, *Heauton*, *Trinummus*.² On the positive side, we can say with assurance that preparation for

¹Cf. sections III.2 and III.2a.

²Cf. section III.2a.

the recognition would be expected in the *Casina* if the recognition took place within the play,³ and that *Adelphoe* 194 was almost undoubtedly preparation for recognition in the play from which it was taken.⁴

One or two points with regard to the technique of specific authors appear fairly certain. Menander's use of proper names in connection with the recognition seems a distinguishing feature of his technique. It is found in the *Epitrepontes* (*Tauropolia*), as well as in the *Eunuchus* (*Sunium*), *Heauton* (*Corinth*), and somewhat less conspicuous use of similar devices is made in other plays.⁵ Apollodorus failed to employ this subtlety in the *Phormio* where we might expect it if the play had been written by Menander. It would be rash indeed, however, to claim that Menander always made use of this device whenever it was possible, and that no other author did so. By this device, the audience is enabled to draw inferences from the speeches of two characters which neither of the characters can. It may be that Diphilus was less concerned with the virtue of his heroines than Menander and certain unknown authors, since the *Rudens* does not contain a trace of the usual assurances on this point, but such a conclusion from so small an amount of evidence is none too certain, and there is a disconcerting note in the prologue of the *Casina*, where assurance of the good character of the heroine is given.⁶ Furthermore, the author of the *Poenulus* does not seem to have been as much concerned with the character of his heroine as the authors of the

³Cf. section II.2a.

⁴Cf. section II.2a.

⁵Cf. section II.2.

⁶Cf. section II.2a.

other plays, but here and even in the Rudens, we do not know what omissions or changes the Roman poet has made.

It is to be noted that there is a large amount of preparation in these plays, and that it is found with remarkable consistency. Recognition and intrigue receive elaborate preparation almost every time that they occur, and this too, regardless of whether the play has an expository prologue. It has been suggested that Terence deliberately abandoned expository prologues in order to achieve a suspended dénouement.⁷ There is every reason to believe, however, that Terence did not deliberately strike out any of the elaborate preparation from the body of the play, but there is no reason for believing that he deliberately increased this preparation. Preparation occurs in equally large amounts in plays from Plautus and Menander. The same considerations are apposite to the Curculio and Epidicus of Plautus, in which there is now no prologue but the usual amount of preparation within the body of the play.⁸ The foretelling of an omniscient prologue speaker, of course, is not as subtle a device as the foreshadowing usually found in preparation, and if Terence deliberately suppressed the expository prologue in order to eliminate this foretelling, then perhaps he is to be praised for his advance in dramatic technique, but we cannot, I think, give him credit for substituting fore-

⁷With reference to An. 221, Frank (AJPXLIX (1928), 318) remarks:

"The Andria, therefore, seems to reveal Terence's first attempt at constructing a play in which a deferred hint took the place of full preparation. One wonders whether the aged Caecilius, who helped Terence with this play, may have used the device before Terence and suggested it to him."

An.220 ff. is an exceptionally clever bit of preparation simply because of the skepticism expressed, but there is every reason to think that all the credit for the device is due Menander, or, more properly, there is no reason for thinking that it is not due him.

⁸Cf. Leo, P.F. 196 ff.

shadowing for foretelling. In all probability, he found a very generous amount of both in the original Greek plays. Not all of the foreshadowing in the plays is upon the same artistic level. A considerable part of it is scarcely more than foretelling: in the omniscient prologue, the poet, as it were, foretells the actions of others; in "explanations" and promissiones, the character on stage foretells his own action. Of this latter type is much of the preparation for intrigues, a much cruder device than, for instance, the "character" preparation for recognition, but no cruder than the repeated statements of free birth which foreshadow the recognition in the *Rudens*. The subtlest type of preparation for intrigue is probably that of the *Heauton*, where Chremes, who is himself to be the real victim, advises his friend Menedemus to allow himself to be tricked, and encourages Syrus to mulct Menedemus. Somewhat similar is the device found in various other plays by which the dupe's expression of caution or of confidence in his ability to avoid being tricked foreshadows his deception. Menander is unusually skillful in making characters reveal to the audience what they themselves do not know. For instance, in the *Heauton Menedemus* (96 f.) and later Syrus (600 ff.) refer to the "mother" of Antiphila as an old woman from Corinth. Later Sostrata says that she gave the girl whom she had borne to an old woman from Corinth (629 f.). The audience is immediately enabled to draw the inference that Antiphila is the daughter of Sostrata. Again, in the *Eunuchus*, Chaerea very naturally reveals the fact that the girl with whom he has fallen in love is sixteen years old (318); so when Chremes says that his sister, if alive, could not be more than sixteen (526 f.), we immediately suspect the identity of the girl.

It should be observed also that the importance of false

preparation differs with the various categories. False preparation or lack of preparation where recognition is concerned is of the greatest importance simply because Ad. 194 is the only sure case of false preparation, and it is known from external evidence to be the result of contamination. With regard to other events, it is not of the first importance, since a considerable amount of it has been found. Still some cases do seem very striking, such as Mil. 806 ff. Other false preparation for intrigues make this case less glaring than it otherwise would be, but they do not offer a thoroughly acceptable excuse for it, as other abandoned banquets do offer an acceptable excuse for the abandoned dinner in the Miles.

INDEX OF AUTHORS CITED (ANCIENT AND MODERN)

Aeschylus, schol. ad Eu., 2n
 Alexis, Carchedonius, 75n
 Anacoides, 1n
 Apollodorus, 48, 98
 Apsines, 1n
 Aristophanes, schol. ad Av., 7n
 Aristotle, 1n, 2
 Athenaeus, 30n

Barrow, 70n

Caecilius, 99n
 Cicero, 1n, 6n
 Clifford, 82n
 Conrad, 13n
Corp. Gloss. Lat., 2n, 3n

Demosthenes, 1n
 Diphilus, 28n-29n, 30n, 33n-35n,
 52, 53n-55n, 98, passim.
 Clerumenoe, 28n
 Paederastae, 30n
 Synapothnescontes, 51-52
 Donatus (Commentum Terenti), 3-9,
 12
 ad Ad., 4n-6n, 24n, 80n, 83, 83n,
 91, 96n
 ad An., 3n-6n, 17, 35n, 36-37,
 37n, 55n, 56, 80, 82, 82n
 ad Eu., 3n-8n, 18, 26-28, 40-41,
 55n, 61, 76, 76n, 87, 96n
 ad Hec., 4n-7n, 38n, 47, 55n
 ad Ph., 1n, 4n-7n, 14, 15n, 47,
 55n, 63-64, 81
 Duckworth, 93n
 Dziatzko, 21n, 46n, 52n, 87n

Enk, 78n
 Ernout-Meillet, 96n
 Euripides, Alc., 37n
 And., 19n; schol., 1n
 schol. ad Hec., 1n, 4n
 Hel., 74n
 schol. ad Hip., 2n
 Ion, 82n
 Iph. Aul., 88n
 schol. ad Med., 7n

Flickinger, 9n, 36n
 Fortunatianus, 2n, 6n
 Fraenkel, 11, 19n, 20n, 42n-43n,
 50n, 53n-55n, 59n-60n, 68n, 72n,

78n, 86n, 87n-88n, 89n, 92n, 94n,
passim.
 Frank, 33n, 93n, 99n

Gellius, 75n
 Geppert, 21n

Harsh, 19n, 50n
 Homer, 11., 29n
 schol. ad Od., 2n, 6n, 7n
 Hough, 23n, 93n

Isidorus, 6n
 [Iulius Rufinianus], 2n
 Iulius Victor, 6n

Jachmann, 11, 19n-20n, 21n, 27n,
 28n-29n, 30n, 33n-35n, 36n, 41n,
 50n, 53n-55n, 59n, 67n-68n, 72n,
 75n-76n, 87n-88n, 92n-93n, passim.
 Jensen, 12, 18, 55n, 56, 84

Karsten, 6n
 Kauer, 12, 52n
 Key, 14n
 Kunst, 60n

Langen, 21n, 65n, 74n, 92n
 Legrand, 11, 20n, 21n, 24n, 25n,
 33n, 36n, 46n, 65n, 83n, 93n
 Leo, 11, 16n, 39n, 50n, 53n, 55n,
 59n-60n, 67n, 68n, 72n, 78n, 83n,
 92, 93n, passim.
 Lindsay, 12, 92, 93n
 Lysias, 1n

Marx, 78n, 88n
 Menander, 2n, 10, 12, 40, 55n, 59n,
 62, 98, 99, 100, passim.
 Carchedonius, 75n
 Citharista, 35n
 Colax, 13
 Dyscolus, 45
 Epit., 40, 59n, 60, 67n, 75n, 84,
 96, 98
 Georgus, 41-42, 42n-43n, 48n
 Heros, 18, 43
 Misumenos, 43, 46n
 Peri., 13, 13n, 19, 23n, 43-44, 48,
 83n, 87, 97
 Perinthia, 93n
 Samia, 32n, 46n, 55-56, 95n

Mnesimachus, Dyscolus, 45
Moorhead, 2n

Norwood, 35n-36n, 55n, 60n, 88n,
89n

Philemon, 78n

Plato, 29n

Plautus, 7, 8, 11, 12, 34n-35n, 99,
passim.

Am., 9, 14n, 16-17, 26n, 76, 93

As., 20, 20n, 23, 33, 62, 65,
65n, 85-86, 91

Au., 19n, 20, 26n, 31-32, 34n, 46n

Ba., 7, 13, 17, 24n, 26, 26n,
56-60, 59n, 61n, 62n, 64n-65n,
67n, 72n, 73-74, 83-84, 88n-89n,
94, 96n

Cap., 21, 21n, 26n, 29n, 32, 51

Cas., 26n, 28-30, 28n-30n, 33,
45n, 52, 53n-55n, 66n, 92, 92n,
93n, 95, 98

Ci., 7, 8, 38-39, 38n-39n, 43n,
66n, 91, 95, 95n-96n

Cu., 16, 16n, 21, 37n, 44-45, 46n,
50n, 53n, 65, 91-92, 99

Dyscolus, 45

Epid., 21, 21n, 26n, 45-46, 46n,
65-66, 74, 87-89, 87n-88n, 94,
94n, 99

Men., 17, 22, 26n, 29n, 33, 81-82,
82n-83n, 84, 96n

Mer., 14-15, 26n, 30-31, 33, 46n,
65, 77-78, 78n-79n, 88n, 90,
95-96, 96n

Mi., 35n, 46n, 53n, 59n-60n, 64n,
66-69, 66n-69n, 74, 76n, 89n, 97,
101

Mo., 9, 15, 22, 29n, 53-55, 62n,
69-70, 86n, 89, 93n, 94-95, 97

Persa, 70, 74-75, 76n, 89-90, 90n

Po., 7, 16, 21n, 23, 41n, 44n,
49-51, 50n, 52n, 59n, 70-72,

71n-72n, 75, 75n-76n, 90, 96n, 98

Ps., 23, 23n, 62n, 64n, 72-73,
73n, 82n, 86, 88n, 89n, 90-91, 93,
93n, 97

Ru., 19n, 26n, 29n, 30n, 33,
33n-35n, 37n, 44n, 48-49, 49n,
50n, 52-53, 53n, 68n, 72n, 78n,
79, 79n, 84-85, 86, 88n, 96n, 98,
99, 100

St., 18-19, 19n, 34n, 78n, 86,
86n, 89n, 97

Tri., 16, 19, 19n-20n, 31, 53n,
59n, 65, 75n, 83n, 87, 90, 96, 97

Tru., 15-16, 16n, 20n, 23-24, 24n, 60,
86n, 89n, 90, 92, 97

Vidularia, 16, 73

Plutarch, 2n

Prehn, 60n

Prescott, 34n, 60n, 90n, 93n

Prolegomenon Sylloge, 1n

Quintilian, 1n, 3n, 6n

Schoell, Friedrich, 54n-55n, 93n

Schoell, Fritz, 82n

Servius, ad Verg. Aen., 2n, 3n, 7n

Skutsch, 55n

Sophocles, schol. ad Aj., 4n

schol. ad Elec., 2n

schol. ad O. C., 1n

Sulpitius Victor, 2n, 6n

Terence, 12, 34n, 55n, 99, 99n, passim.

Ad., 24n, 25, 29n, 35n, 51-52, 52n,
65n, 80n, 83, 83n, 90, 91, 96n, 97,
98, 101

An., 9, 11, 13n, 17, 18n, 21n, 26n,
35-38, 35n, 37n, 38n, 47, 48, 56,

80, 82, 82n, 96n, 99n

Eu., 6n, 8, 13, 17, 18, 20, 26-28,
27n, 29n, 30n, 31n, 34n, 37n, 40-41,

40n, 41n, 46n, 48, 48n, 60-61, 73n,

76-77, 76n, 85, 86-87, 96n, 98, 100

Hea., 17, 39n, 40n, 42-43, 48, 61-62,
65n, 80, 83n, 85, 87, 97, 98, 100

Hec., 6n, 13, 13n, 14, 22, 25n-26n,
32-33, 32n, 34n, 38n, 46-47, 46n,
77n, 96

Ph., 13n, 14, 15n, 23, 26n, 33, 37n,
38n, 39n, 43n, 46n, 47-48, 62-64,

62n, 64n, 74n, 76n, 80-81, 86, 92, 98

Thiele, 36n

Tibullus, 43n

Ussing, 29n

Vergil, 93n-94n

Wessner, 12

Wheeler, 74n, 87n

Wilamowitz, 2n, 68n

